DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 185 SO 009 137

TITLE	Seeking a Just Society through Population Education. Proceedings of the Population Education Workshop Sponsored by the Department of Elementary Schools of the National Catholic Educational Association (Washington, D.C., December 15-17, 1974).
INSTITUTION	National Catholic Educational Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 75
NOTE	69p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Population Task Force, National Catholic Educational Association, 1 Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 350, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.75 paper, 10-25 copies 10 percent discount, 25 or more copies 20 percent discount)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Abortions; *Catholic Schools; Contraception; Curriculum Planning; Demography; Elementary Secondary Education; Food; Global Approach; Justice; *Population Education; Population Growth; Population Trends; Program Descriptions; World Problems

ABSTRACT

The goals of the workshop were (1) to provide an overview of the population problem in the world today as it affects the survival and quality of life of people throughout the world; (2) to explore the meaning of population education within the context of the Catholic educational community; (3) to provide methodologies for the development and utilization of curriculum for population education; and (4) to elicit action plans for the Catholic schools which involve administration, faculty, parents, and students in seeking solutions to population problems within the context of the Bishops' statement on social justice. The publication contains the following papers: The Population Problem in Building a Just Society by Rev. J. Bryan Hehir; What Is Population? by Dr. Leon Bouvier; Food and Population: A New World View Needed by Gerald E. Connolly; Teaching About Global Interdependence and Development by Jayne Millar Wood; What Each of Us Can Do by Judith R. Seltzer; Population Education as Part of Education for Justice by Rev. Peter J. Henriot, SJ; and Population Issues in Catholic Curricula: A Plan of Action by Brother John D. Olsen, CFX. Names and addresses of the NCEA Task Force and names of the NCEA officers are provided. (Author/RM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

POPULATION EDUCATION

Workshop Proceedings

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED127185

SO 009 137

The National Catholic
Educational Association

NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Most Rev. Cletus F. O'Donnell, Chairman
Rev. John F. Meyers, President

Msgr. John F. Murphy	College and University Department
Rev. David M. Murphy	Seminary Department
Msgr. Francis X. Barrett	Chief Administrators of Catholic Education
Bro. John D. Olsen, CFX	Secondary School Department
Sister Kathleen Short, OP	Elementary School Department
Rev. Alfred McBride, O. Praem.	Department of Religious Education
Rev. Emmet Harrington	Department of Continuing Education
Rev. Frank H. Bredeweg, CSB	Director of Special Projects
Dr. Mary-Angela Harper	Boards of Education
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Elmer H. Behrmann	Special Education Department
Joseph O'Donnell	Vice President of Business Affairs
Mrs. Rhoda Goldstein	Director of Membership
Carl Balcerak	Director of Communication

Copies of this publication may be obtained by writing:

Publication Sales
National Catholic Educational Association
One Dupont Circle, Suite 350
Washington, DC 20036

__Prepaid__ prices of publication, including postage and mailing charges:

1 - 9 copies	$2.75 per copy
10 - 25 copies	10% discount
Over 25 copies	20% discount

Orders of less than $10.00 must be prepaid.

Checks should be made payable to:

National Catholic Educational Association

SEEKING A JUST SOCIETY
THROUGH
POPULATION EDUCATION

Proceedings

of

The Population Education Workshop

Sponsored by

The Department of Elementary Schools

of

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Washington, D.C.

December 15-17, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome and Background Information 1

The Population Problem in Building a Just Society 3

What is Population? 20

Food and Population: A New Worldview Needed 26

Teaching About Global Interdependence and Development 40

What Each of Us Can Do 46

Population Education as Part of Education for Justice 49

Population Issues in Catholic Curricula: A Plan of Action 60

Cover design by Carl Balcerak

WELCOME AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Sister Kathleen Short, OP

It is my happy privilege to welcome all of you to the NCEA Population Education Workshop and to say that I am delighted that so many of you could take time away from your busy schedules to attend.

Perhaps it might be in order to comment briefly on the Population Education Task Force which authorized this workshop. As you probably know, 1974 has been designated World Population Year by the United Nations. On the occasion of the National Council of Catholic Bishops' meeting in Washington two years ago, a strong plea was voiced for all Catholics across the nation to take a positive approach to the population question. The National Catholic Educational Association wished to do its part to respond to this call for action by the bishops of the country. In conjunction, therefore, with the Center of Concern, the NCEA set up a Population Education Task Force, the members of which were drawn from various areas of interest across the nation. The Task Force consists of representatives of USCC, the Bishops' Committee on Population and Pro-Life Activities, the Center of Concern, and from the Campaign for Human Development. Demographers, representatives of teacher-training institutions, curriculum development coordinators, directors of education, personnel from the Center of Concern, and the NCEA departmental executive secretaries are also members of the Task Force.

Great interest was generated concerning the work of the NCEA Task Force by an article written by Sister Thelma Wurzelbacher, a member of the faculty of the School of Natural Resources of the University of Michigan. Entitled, "Population: Social Concern for the Celibate," this article appeared in the magazine Sisters Today and sparked many requests for information on the population program which was being sponsored by NCEA.

Time will not permit a lengthy explanation regarding details of the two meetings held by the Task Force. Discussion focused primarily on population and population issues. There were points of agreement and many strong disagreements on several issues. However, the Task Force unanimously viewed population as a vehicle for value expression. It was obvious to all that the positive approach called for by bishops would entail an educational process, and the most pressing need in the educational community regarding population education was in the area of teacher-training. Discussion focused on alternative ways in which in-service teacher-training could be implemented. The original thrust was to present a pilot program for teacher-training to be held at some centrally located spot most available to participants. An invitation was to be sent to 100 selected participants from across the country. These would be chosen from local and regional committees on the basis of their potential for disseminating their newly-acquired population education training.

Hoping to relieve the participants of the high cost of travel, meals and housing for such a workshop, a proposal to fund this effort was drawn up and submitted to twenty foundations, including the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The amount requested was $25,000, and although the majority of the foundations termed the project laudable, they reported that their funds were not allocated to this type of project. The only alternative approach open to the Task Force was a workshop embracing participants from a particular geographic area of the country. So here we are.

The goals of the workshop are as follows:

1. To provide to participants an overview of the population problem in the world today as it affects the survival and quality of life of people throughout the world.

2. To explore the meaning of population education within the context of the Catholic educational community.

3. To provide methodologies for the development and utilization of curriculum for population education.

4. To elicit action plans for the Catholic schools which involve administration, faculty, parents, and very directly the students, in seeking solutions to population problems within the context of the Bishops' statement on social justice.

It is my sincere hope that you will find this Population Education Workshop a profitable experience and that the knowledge you receive will assist you in seeking solutions to possible problems within the context of the Bishops' statement.

Sister Kathleen Short, OP (SLV)
Population Education Task Force Coordinator
NCEA

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Mrs. Eleanor Haub who transcribed the tapes and edited the material for publication.

THE POPULATION PROBLEM
in
BUILDING A JUST SOCIETY

Rev. J. Bryan Hehir

I am going to talk more about the context of the population problem than I am about the content of the population problem; the reason is because I know that Father Henriot is going to talk about the content of the population problem and Gerry Connolly is going to talk about the content of the food problem as it relates to population. I will try to set the framework in which these issues exist. Very specifically, I would like to look at population as a problem of international politics today, to examine how the population question fits into the agenda of international issues. Then, I want to address specifically the question of the Church and population as population fits into the international agenda. My presentation will move through three steps.

First, I want to argue that the primary characteristic of international relations today is the fact of interdependence. Second, I want to look at population in an interdependent world. Third, I want to look at the Church and population in an interdependent world.

I. Interdependence: The Fate and Future of International Politics

I think it is fair to argue that interdependence is emerging as the central theme of international politics. An interdependent world is a world of interrelated problems, and population is one of those interrelated problems comprising the fabric of interdependence. Hence, population needs to be seen within the context of a series of issues: food, consumption questions, questions of energy crisis and the whole set of socio-economic issues of trade, tariffs and development that make up the international economic system. This means, that in raising the issue of education and population, we are really surfacing a much broader question than just population.

The thesis I will argue is that from the educator's point of view the key issue is how do you educate for an interdependent world. What kind of sense of perspective of the world is necessary to live in an interdependent world in such a way that it becomes a civil and humane world? Now if an educator asks the question, "How do you educate for an interdependent world?", there are two very specific challenges that emerge. First, grasping the scope of the problem of interdependence: what are the elements? Second, grasping how very rapidly this theme of interdependence has emerged, not only for the Church, but also the world of international affairs.

If I can use a personal example that may crystallize things just a bit, I had Dr. Kissinger in class seven years ago and the range of issues that have absorbed his attention over the past year (except for the Middle East and SALT talks) are issues that he never mentioned in his lectures on international politics. The food, energy and interdependence themes were simply not examined in a typical course on international affairs. What I want to do tonight is to discuss how this central question has emerged in international politics: the question of interdependence. I think the speed with which the problem of interdependence has emerged in international affairs can be seen if we take a fairly careful look at the evolution of the international system of the goal from 1945 - 1975. Over that thirty-year period I would argue that we have gone through three changes in the configuration of the globe, and two of them have occurred within the past eight years. Let me sketch the three stages.

The first period is the era now known as the Cold War; it took shape between 1945 and 1949. The globe maintained the basic characteristics of the Cold War period, I would argue, up through the mid-sixties. It is almost impossible to date these years, but if you want a date, say 1968. Now, what is the picture of the globe in this period? The structure of the globe involved two major powers, the Soviet Union and the U.S. And for all practical purposes up through at least the end of the 1950's nobody else really counted on the globe. The role of every other nation was to make a choice between the two superpowers. Europe, especially in the period right after the War, was completely dependent upon the U.S. for its security and its economic viability. Eastern Europe was in the Soviet camp. Finally, it was not regarded as a tolerable stance in international affairs for a state to remain neutral between the two superpowers. It was not only regarded as unwise, but, for example, Secretary Dulles regarded India as following an immoral policy if it did not choose between one of the two superpowers. The substance of the problems in this Cold War period took the following shape: the overwhelming fact of international affairs was the existence of nuclear power and what it would mean for international affairs. Power in international terms was interpreted as strategic or military power. Economic issues were regarded as being subordinate to security concerns. In other words, economic issues were not primary issues on anybody's foreign policy agenda. The primary issues were: what do you do about controlling the nuclear power problem and what do you do about containing your adversary, either the U.S. or the Soviet Union. Within the context of the Cold War period there were very strong alliances. Western Europe was very closely tied to us; Eastern Europe, by definition, was tied to the Soviets. The rest of the world was regarded as an open field for competition between the two superpowers.

The perception of the globe during this period, to state it simplistically, is what an economist would call a zero sum game; that is to say that everywhere the Soviets made a gain it was perceived we lost. Everyplace we made a gain it was perceived they lost. The picture of the globe is one in which we had total competition between two superpowers. Whether it was Korea, Malaysia or Berlin, there was no place on the globe that was regarded as neutral. Everytime one side picked up a piece of territory it gained influence and the other partner felt that it had lost.

That Cold War structure of the globe began to break down under the following events:

First: after a period of time it was perceived that nuclear weapons were very important if either of the superpowers ultimately decided to go to nuclear war. Yet in another sense the possession of nuclear power paralyzed the two superpowers, because the consequences of using it meant that both of them would be destroyed. When other countries perceived that there was a kind of paralysis built into the day-by-day workings of superpowers then the powers began to exercise a certain degree of independence. On our side it was De Gaulle who saw that in fact we couldn't let him go, and that he didn't have to follow all our orders in order to stay under our protection. He set out on a course of his own. On the Soviet side of the fence it was the Chinese who perceived at a certain point in time that there was room for maneuver, that they were not totally subject to the Soviets.

Second: the superpower world began to break down to some degree because through membership in the UN and through growing nationalism in the Third World, those nations became less and less subject to political manipulation. It was harder to dominate Third World nations.

Third: under the framework of the nuclear arms problem, the superpowers began to perceive that they had some common interests. Basically, it was more in their interest to avoid nuclear war than to risk it. Hence, the world assumed the character of a "mixed-interest" game; that is to say, there are some things we both have an interest in preserving, like avoiding nuclear war and building cultural, political and economic ties. As soon as this kind of process begins then it isn't simply the superpower relations that change, relations change throughout the system. With all those factors working by the mid-sixties we began moving into a new kind of world, a second stage of evolution of the international system.

This stage of evolution was highlighted in the early foreign policy reports of the Nixon-Kissinger administration. The point was made that we were in a different kind of world; if we continued to think of the world in Cold War terms, we wouldn't be able to take advantage of the opportunity. The basic shift was from a two-power world, the Soviet Union and the U.S., to a five-power world, involving the superpowers along with Japan, W. Europe and China. Now rather than depicting the world geographically as an ellipse with two centers, the world was depicted as a pentagon with five centers of power.

Immediately the world became harder to understand. In the Cold War World there was a certain clarity; you knew who your friends were, you knew who your enemies were, and you knew what the issues were that divided us. If you asked what power was in the Cold War world, you knew that it was nuclear power. A five-part world is more complex. For example, if you ask in a five-power world, "who's got the power?", the first question which arises is, "what kind of power do you mean?" Different people have different kinds of power.

Indeed, you can't understand the five-power world as a pentagon. You only can understand what's going on in the five-power world if you break it down into three triangles. The centers of strategic power are Washington, Moscow and Peking. The issues that are operative in that strategic triangle are the issues of how you avoid nuclear war; how you do something about the arms race, making it safer, smaller and cheaper without sacrificing security; how do you make sure the superpowers don't come into collision so that by mistake they fall into a nuclear war, i.e., the Middle East. The dynamic of the relationships in the strategic triangle involves a combination of deterrent and detente. The second set of relationships involve economic power; the powers are the U.S., W. Europe and Japan. You see now here's where the complexity enters. There are states in the world that are strategic powers, like the Soviet Union, but are not major economic powers. Conversely there are states that are economic giants, like Japan, but strategic pygmies.

In the economic triangle the principal issues are the monetary question and the trade question. The dynamics of the economic triangle are surprisingly like a mirror image of the dynamics of the superpower triangle. Under detente states who were previously enemies (in total opposition to one another) become adversaries (involved in a combination of cooperation and conflict). During the Cold War the Soviets and we perceived each other to being in total opposition in everything. Now we perceive each other in a combination of conflict and cooperation. We've moved from enemies to adversaries. What happened in the economic triangle between the U.S., Japan and Europe is that we moved from being allies to adversaries; as their economic power grew they became competitors with us in trade and in the monetary system. The complexity of the world involves moving from a world in which there are enemies and friends, to a world which is composed of a series of limited adversary relationships. We've got some common interests with the Russians; we've got some conflicts with the Russians. We have some common interests with the Japanese; we've got some conflicts with the Japanese. The transition is from clarity to complexity.

Then there is a third triangle. In the first two triangles, strategic and economic, we were talking about the relationships between power people, those who had power and those who were in competition with one another for power. This third triangle is what I would call the moral triangle and the actors in this triangle are the First World, the Second World and the Third World. We commonly perceive the First World as the western hemisphere and Europe; the Second World as the Communist bloc; and the Third World as the whole set of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The issues in this triangle were the issues of power and powerless. This was in the late sixties and it had been that way since the end of World War II. The specific issues are about questions of aid, trade and development. These issues have taken on a sharper focus in the emerging discussion about a New International Economic Order. The three triangles, strategic, economic and moral, constituted the five-power world. Before we had a chance to get used to it, events left it behind. We did not move out of it but we modified it.

The trends of transition involved first of all the Middle East War, and the whole role of oil in international affairs. This was the fourth round of the Middle East War and previous to this there had never been the use of oil in international affairs as a real weapon. One of the significant shifts in this Middle East War in '73 was that before he went to war Sadat was able to bring Faisal on board with a commitment that he would use oil as a weapon, and that changed the whole complexion, not only of the Middle East War, but the complexion of international affairs. It changed the complexion in the sense that people began to see how countries that had previously been regarded as poor, if they had critical resources were really potentially powerful countries. So the Arabs used oil as a political weapon. The significance of this is that the first major crack in the NATO alliance at a time of significant international crisis occurred in the Middle East War of '74. We had always been worried about the fragility of NATO, how it would act when Berlin was under pressure or when we failed to get cohesion in Vietnam, but it was the Middle East War in '74 which cracked it. So the oil weapon was a very significant weapon. It severely tested an alliance that had stood for 25 years. The significance of the oil cartel was three-fold for the world. First of all it provided a model for others, since the oil cartel was formed in '74 several other cartels have now been formed around other resources. People are learning the game. Countries that are regarded as poor realize they have critical resources and they are trying to form bargaining units to imitate the Arabs' tactic of bargaining with oil. Whether they will ever be able to do it as successfully as the Arabs have done with oil is a different question. But they are trying. Secondly, the economic triangle of the U.S., Western Europe and Japan has been substantially changed since '73. If you ask where the economic power in the globe is - petro-dollars which have flowed into the Arab world this year have made the economic triangle a quadrangle. The Arabs are now part of economic power; in twelve months they have moved into a position of immense power and the economies of the West are under strain in a way that they haven't been under since the end of World War II. Thirdly, the moral triangle has been changed by the oil cartel; now it is necessary to distinguish between what is commonly called the Third World and the Fourth World. The Third World are those countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America that do possess either critical resources like oil or are beginning to move into the process of industrialization like Korea or Taiwan. The Fourth World includes countries in Asia and Africa which don't have resources or have not been able to move toward industrialization or have chosen not to and who are afflicted with the most basic problems of organizing a society.

The existence of the Opec countries brings a new center of power into the world and it's not all bad, by any means. For twenty-five years we have been trying to do something about the Third World, but it has been a process of powerless dealing with powerful. I think it would be fair to argue now, the existence of OPEC resembles very much the process whereby the unions of this country began to form counter-weight to management. Now power begins to deal with power, and there are some indications that this kind of situation offers a better chance for justice. It also has built into it the possibility of chaos. These changing factors constitute the third phase of development in the international system. It is the world of interdependence. An interdependent world is a world of interrelated issues. How do you deal with population and food? How do you deal with scarce resources: bauxite, food, oil, tin, copper? How do you deal with rates of consumption when there is only so much for so many in the globe? Those are the kinds of issues that begin to emerge in an interdependent world. These issues begin to make clear in empirical or factual terms what the Synod of Bishops spoke of in 1971 when they said we face in the international system the paradox of the present moment: that the world is becoming materially more unified and yet that unification is leading increasingly to conflict. Our greater material unity, i.e., our communication systems, our technology, and our dependence upon common resources make us much more aware that it is one globe than we had previously recognized.

But the existence of that material interdependence says nothing about whether we are going to have a community of interdependence or chaos in the midst of interdependence. The significance of talking about an interdependent world is the recognition that we are at a kind of primordial or pivotal point in international relations. How do we set the rules for the game once we realize that for a whole series of resources some have what all need. How do we set the rules for the game when we begin to feel the pressure between numbers of people and amounts of resources.

It is a primordial or pivotal point because the recognition of that problem is not unlike international relations in the 15th and 16th centuries. Then the question was, how do you set the rules for the European nations as they deal with the new world? In other words we are in a period where people are trying to define whole new rules of conduct. Unless we get new rules for the game we can turn it into absolute conflict.

The essence of the problem of an interdependent world is that we have a series of what are called transnational issues. Those are issues that cut across nations, that no one nation, no matter how strong or powerful, can solve itself and yet in the face of those transnational issues we have a world of national actors, nations and states. The inadequacy of the nation-state to deal with transnational problems of interdependence is evident, yet we have no ready-made substitute.

We have a huge problem and an inadequate instrument to deal with it. An interesting thing is that if you look at Pope John's encyclical, _Pacem in terris_ , he defined this problem in 1963. He said then, "You need to determine the structure of authority in a human community; you need to determine what kind of structure of authority you need by the scope of the problems you face to resolve the common good." And he said in the 5th chapter of _Pacem in terris_ , we've got a set of problems today that we cannot deal with using our present structure of development. So he called for something above and beyond the structure of nation-states. Now in 1963 that sounded like a very high-sounding moral statement with which no one would disagree but no one was convinced that it was a matter of great urgency. Pope John's moral statement of 1963, I would argue, is empirically demonstrable today; the limitations of the nation-state can be illustrated with three sets of issues.

First of all, what constituted a state was its ability to defend itself. Today the two most powerful nations of the globe cannot defend themselves; the Soviet Union and the U.S. do not defend themselves against each other. There is absolutely no way in which the U.S. could prevent the Soviet Union from dropping missiles on New York or Chicago. No defense is available. The only thing we can do is to promise that when they hit us, we can hit Vladivostok or Moscow. It's a mutual suicide pact and we call that "deterrence" - it is not defense. But you see the difference: defense depends on self-sufficiency; I control my destiny. Deterrence depends on cooperation: if you don't cooperate we both lose. Everybody knows that the two most powerful nations can't defend themselves.

Second, an economic issue; there is no way in which any state, no matter how powerful, can insulate itself today against the forces of the international economic system. The framework of the international monetary fund and the general agreement on trade and tariff which we set up as the framework for economic relations at the end of World War II are under severe strain today and no nation in the western world can insulate itself from the fragility of those institutions.

Third, the environment; if you believe that clear air and clean water are in short supply and need to be conserved, but your neighbor doesn't believe it, you're going to have dirty water. If France and Germany are both convinced of the need for a clean river running between their boundaries, that's fine. If one is convinced and the other isn't, there is going to be a dirty river there. And if 2/3 of the world is convinced that nuclear testing is harmful and 1/3 isn't, there is going to be Strontium 90 in the milk supply.

All I'm trying to point out is that the nation-state model was a model of the world that was built on self-sufficiency, and an interdependent world is a model in which not by moral wish but by the most hard-nosed empirical problems we know that nobody is self-sufficient. Project Independence is about as viable as the Edsel. All of that material you could get in much better analytical terms in any good course in international relations today, but I think all of it is necessary if we are not going to talk in airy terms of interdependence.

II. Interdependence: The Prism of Population

The question we face is what does interdependence mean. Here is where the educator enters the discussion, because a significant issue that interdependence poses is "how do we learn to live locked together in a limited globe?" Those are the terms that define interdependence for me. I think the first characteristic of interdependence is that we recognize we are locked together in the globe. Now if Americans had once to learn the meaning of interdependence, we no longer have to learn it. We learned it last winter, not in a classroom, not in a book, but at the gas station. The gas prices pointed up the first meaning of interdependence. We learned how directly the actions of others can intervene into the homes of each and every one of us. We learned how vulnerable we are. Yet, the other side of being vulnerable to one another is being responsible for one another. That's why the energy crisis was a teachable moment in the country, but nobody did any teaching. We were on the receiving end of interdependence; our fate was in somebody elses' hands. But nobody reminded us of the times when someone else's fate is in our hands, when we are on the power end of the equation.

So this Fall we pay the price of not having taught at a teachable moment because this Fall the issue is the food crisis and that's the other side of the coin of interdependence.

Canada and the U.S. control more of the exportable food in the world than the Arabs do of oil. This Fall we are in the decision-making role and it is others who sit and wait to see what we're going to do with their lives. We are locked together in the globe; our actions do make a difference. The Arab decision did deprive me of my normal habits, whether for good or ill, of driving; and the decisions made this Fall on food are going to determine just who eats and who doesn't. The religious significance of living in that kind of world was best highlighted a century ago by Dostoevsky when he said, "the death of one innocent child is enough to destroy belief in God." We know today on a global basis, in a way Dostoevsky never knew, how many innocent children will die and we know why. At least in part we know why.

The second part of interdependence is that we are locked together in a limited globe and this the food crisis points up in drastic clarity for us. If we were simply locked together in a globe where we were responsible for one another, if it were a globe of unlimited resources, then the pressure of the problem would be less; the pressure of the problem would simply be how you move the surplus around. That's complicated enough in a worldwide problem, but at least you are sure there is a surplus. Now in fact the essence of the food decision which you will hear about later in the week is precisely this: for 25 years we fed a lot of hungry people; we fed them for a variety of reasons but among those reasons was the fact that it was good economics to feed them. We produced more food than we could consume, the government bought the food to keep the prices high for the farmers, and after a while it became better to get rid of that food than to continue to store it. So for 25 years the essence of our problem was sharing the excess and that is known as charity. Today the surplus is gone and the essence of the problem is sharing our scarcity - that's justice. How do you determine who gets access to a limited resource. How do you adjudicate the rights of people because there is a tough problem on the food question. It's a problem of scarce food here (in the form of more expensive food) for the first time since the end of the war and starving people there We are locked together in the world, our decisions do make a difference; and we are locked together in a limited world. There's only so much for so many.

Now the significant thing I think to keep in mind is that this problem of a locked and limited world is not a passing problem. There is a certain long-term dimension to this question. When we talk about educating for an interdependent world, I think it is fair to say that as difficult as the choices will be for us this winter, they will be at least equally difficult for someone in the third grade now in say twenty years. The conception they have of the globe, whether it is ruled by project independence, or of interdependence will make a difference, a lot of difference.

Within the context of a locked and limited globe then it is necessary to highlight population, since population is one of the pressures on food. If the existing growth rate of global population is projected into the next generation, then simply to feed the globe as we are feeding it now would mean doubling the world's food supply in a generation. Now it is not impossible to expand the world's food supply, but doubling it within a generation is a substantial task. Population is part of the interdependence problem.

The question is what our perspective on the problem is. How does population fit into this framework of food, energy and other resources and the whole socio-economic structure that determines the distribution of the world product? There are three approaches to the problem of population; I will sketch them in the most cryptic fashion.

First, there is the approach that holds that population is the problem. It is the No. 1 problem because of its causal effect and it is the problem to be tackled first. Now I think it is fair to say that in terms of themes and emphasis that approach emerges from the U.S. and from Western Europe.

Second, there is a position that says population is no problem. The people more or less identified with that perspective, curiously enough, are the Marxists and the Catholic Church.

Third, there is a position in the middle that says that population is part of the problem. This perspective basically argues that to do something about population in the globe means facing the ultimate question: "what is it that motivates someone to restrain population?" The historical evidence points to the fact that restraint on population follows upon a certain level of socio-economic development. Hence, population is not the problem, it is part of the problem, and it can only be dealt with within a framework of socio-economic development.

Although nobody holds any one of those positions with crystal clarity, the approach that one assumes along the spectrum defines the following issues: first you get a definition of what the problem is, and then, depending on the definition of what the problem is, you get a key target. So, for example, if it is argued that population is the problem, the U.S. rate of population growth is close to zero, but the 3% growth rates are in Asia and Africa; so that they are the problem. The problem on the globe are those people and the solution to the problem (because population is the problem) is to get some form of contraception to them quickly, accompanied by persuasion or seduction or coercion.

On the other hand, if it is argued that population is no problem, then the real problem is simply that we've got enough of everything and we can't distribute it. Hence the key targets are those who control the socio-economic structure, primarily the U.S. and Western Europe. The solution is redoing those socio-economic structures.

The middle position argues that we have to do something about socio-economic structures and the distribution of power in the globe. To use the language of the UN VI Special Session last April, it is necessary to redefine the rules of the international economic order. Finally, in addition to examining the relationship of population and development, it is also necessary to examine the relationship of consumption patterns and available global resources.

Now let's look at the Church and the population problem in an interdependent world. First, the potential of the Church; second, at the position of the Church in the U.S. and the population problem; and third, at a posture for the Church to deal with the population problem. I think the potential of the Church is better than we sometimes think because the record of the Church, at least in terms of what it says about the socio-economic problem and the consumption problem is rather substantial. If we examine *Populorum progressio*, *Mater et Magister*, and the Synodal document, *Justice in the World*, they are saying things that sound very real in an interdependent world. These documents speak of the need to redefine the rules of the game, of the need for a higher degree of cooperation, of the need to recognize interdependence as a fact of life. That all sounds pretty good. Population specifically, in my own opinion, always sounds like an issue we are not willing to face. Hence, while our potential to deal with the problem is good, I think it too often sounds as if we are not willing to take the other half of the question.

Let me move from those two general statements to the Church in the U.S. As we look at an interdependent of interrelated issues, I think it is not only necessary to look at the whole framework but to ask what are the questions that most pertinently should be addressed in our country. First, that the inclination in the U.S. is to talk about the population dimension. The U.S. delegation in Bucharest and at Rome were, I believe, either explicitly instructed or at least cautioned against raising or discussing the consumption question. The Pope, at the food conference, had a six-page speech on socio-economic structures, with one paragraph on population. *The New York Times* quoted *one* sentence out of his speech and it was on population. If you ask what are the things that we are most directly involved in, our population growth at the minute is not an immediate threat to anyone. Yet our socio-economic power and our consumption patterns are very much relevant to that interdependent world. This is a place where the Church can at least keep trying to address the balance of the dialogue: where is the discussion of socio-economic structures? Where is the discussion about consumption? Just as many Catholics believe population is *the* problem as anybody else. Remember, I am not saying that it is *not* a problem. I would not tolerate any analysis that argued that it is not a problem. So I think we can enter the dialogue with the very explicit purpose of how to balance that dialogue.

However, this raises the third point: what posture do we assume upon entering the dialogue? I think if we want to talk in the U.S. about "contra-consumption," and want to talk about socio-economic structure, we're at least going to have to find a way of explicitly raising the issue that people think we are not willing to face: the population question specifically so-called. I feel we can address the population issue. In the U.S. Bishop's statement of 1973, I think they did address it. But I am just reflecting out loud about the ground we could stand on, on being able to say more about population and therefore not being open to having every statement we make interpreted in such a way that somebody shoots at what we didn't say rather than addressing what we did say. The Pope's talk was an excellent speech; it had all kinds of messages for the American agenda on foreign policy - but see the discussion ends up on what we *didn't* say rather than what we *did* say. I don't say that was his fault but I say we have to recognize how that dynamic works.

The elements of population policy which are of primary concern to Catholic teaching are the questions of the means of population control and the interpretation of human rights in population policy. The proposition being argued in this article is that there is a need and a possibility to move Catholic thinking ahead on both of these issues in determining public policy for the Church during the Population Year. Specifically, we should recognize that the Catholic position on permissible means of population control can be recast without detriment to existing teaching, and that the Catholic policy position should be recast to give primacy to the question of human rights rather than to the question of technical means of population limitation. How can these two moves be made and why should they be made? They can be made by explicating some dimensions of Pope Paul's statement on population policy in Populorum progressio in the light of traditional Catholic social ethics. They should be made because by reshaping Catholic policy in this way we can make the Church a more active participant in the population-policy debate, and we can specify some moral issues in that debate of concern to the wider human community.

The statement of Paul VI which is our starting point occurs in his discussion of population and governmental policy in Populorum progressio. After acknowledging the existence of the problem of population growth and resource allocation, the Pope wrote: "It is certain that public authorities can intervene, within the limit of their competence, by favoring the availability of appropriate information and by adopting suitable measures, provided that these be in conformity with the moral law and that they respect the rightful freedom of married couples." [4] This statement constituted an advance beyond previous papal positions in its explicit affirmation of the existence of an objective problem of population growth and in its general legitimation of governmental intervention in the area of population questions. What the statement did not do was to clarify the meaning of suitable measures of population control nor did it offer a response in principle of how to adjudicate the relationship of personal and familial rights with the responsibilities of public authorities.

Since he made this statement, Pope Paul has also authored Humanae vitae, which dealt at great length with the question of suitable means of family planning for Catholics. The question which arises on the level of public policy for the Church is whether the response to the means question in Humanae vitae, which prohibits any contraceptive technique save for rhythm, must be or should be taken as a specification of the general statement on means found in Populorum progressio. Should this be the public-policy position of the Church? Or should the policy position in 1974 be simply a reiteration of the paragraph from Populorum progressio, continuing to cast the issue of means in those unspecified terms?

Both of these approaches would be an inadequate policy response for the church to make in the Population Year. To use Humanae vitae as the basis of our public-policy posture is to ignore the difference between teaching personal morality and teaching about public policy. To repeat

[4] Paul VI, Populorum progressio, no. 37 (New York: Paulist, 1967.)

Populorum progressio without further reflection leaves the Catholic policy position too general and ill-defined. We need to be more specific, but we should specify our stance on the level of social policy, not personal morality. Moreover, neither of the above mentioned responses is required by previous Catholic teaching. We have the possibility of moving beyond the choice of using Humanae vitae as our public policy or of simply repeating Populorum progressio. The way to move is through the means question to the rights question.

In discussing the question of suitable means of population control, the strategy of the Church should be to base its position on number 37 of Populorum progressio, but to elaborate this statement of principle in light of the traditional distinction in Catholic social ethics between public and private morality. Every action of the person, whether internal or external, private or public, personal or social, is bound by the moral law. However, not every command or prohibition of the moral law can or should be translated directly into civil law or into the realm of public policy. While consistently affirming its right and obligation to teach on all dimensions of the moral order, the Church has not felt obliged to see the entire corpus of Catholic teaching incorporated in the civil law or public policy of a society. In situations of moral and religious pluralism (the factual global situation today), where highly controverted issues of morality are at stake, the determination of whether to seek to bring all dimensions of public law or policy into accord with Catholic teaching depends upon a series of moral judgments about the nature of the issue involved, the intelligibility of Catholic teaching to others, the authority employed in the teaching, and a series of prudential calculations about the consequences for the Church and society of seeking to make the teaching the norm for societal action.

In the formulation of a public policy for the Population Year, the Church could use this traditional line of reasoning to clarify its public stance on the means question. There are gounds in both the area of moral analysis and the calculation of political consequences to argue that, except for the means of abortion and sterilization, the Church should not oppose nor seek to prohibit public authorities from designing and implementing policies which employ a range of contraceptive techniques. In other words, save for the issues of abortion and sterilization, the strategy of the Church would be to regard contraceptive practice as an issue of private morality which the Church continues to teach for its members, but not an issue of public morality on which it seeks to affect public policy.

Justification for this position can be garnered morally from the style of recent Church teaching on contraception. While continuing to affirm a natural-law argument against contraception, the arguments of Gaudium et spes(no. 51) and Humanae vitae (nos. 4, 11,12) rely heavily upon the Church's right to interpret natural law. While this point is not new, the emphasis accorded the authoritative character of the teaching in discerning the content of natural law renders it less useful for those in society who do not accept the teaching authority of the Church. If acceptance of Church teaching authority is so intrinsically linked to understanding of the rationale of the Church's position against contraception, there is moral reason not to seek to bind an entire society with the position. An empirical assessment of the possibility of establishing even minimal societal consensus on a prohibition of contraception policy reinforces this normative judgment.

The logic of this position, while not ignoring the highly debated character of contraception within the Church, is not based upon the status of Humanae Vitae among Catholics. Theoretically, one could hold literally to the position espoused in the Encyclical for Catholics and still argue that we ought not to make that position the basis of our public policy during the Population Year. The public position on contraceptive policies could be a posture of a discreet silence. We could withdraw public opposition from contraceptive policies, leaving to the decisions of public authorities within specified limits the formulation and implementation of means questions.

The logic of the position being argued here involves a low profile for the Church on the means question in population policy. It does not involve a low profile on the substantive morality of population policies espoused by public authorities. The argument is to shift the emphasis of the moral case, not to eschew it. A low profile on means of contraceptive technique is only one dimension of policy. It should be correlated with another position: a strict, explicit, unyielding opposition to any attempt to employ abortion as a means of population control. These two elements, explicit condemnation of abortion combined with an implicit but clear neutrality about other forms of contraception in public programs, provide the parameters of a "means policy" for the Church.

The objection often raised against such a proposal is that by decreasing our opposition to contraception, we weaken our position on abortion. This is not convincing; in fact, the contrary argument can be made There is real value for the Church, strategically and substantively, in taking advantage of the Population Year to distinguish the issues of abortion and contraception in the mind of Catholics and in the public mind. The need to distinguish the issues can be seen in responding to two positions which fail to differentiate them. The first is the argument sometimes used by Catholics: it asserts an intrinsic link between contraception and abortion and a process of inevitable deterioration from use of one to the other. The second, the mirror image of the first, is the argument employed by some proponents of population control who wish to use abortion as a safeguard or support in cases of contraceptive failure. This position also asserts that the distinction between contraception and abortion is a distinction without a difference. Passage from one means of population control to another is not regarded as either morally or politically significant. Against both of these arguments the Church should clarify the intrinsic moral difference between abortion and contraception and the distinctively different standing they have in terms of public morality.

The difference in the moral order is the qualitative distinction between how we decide morally whether we should begin a new life and how we decide morally about our responsibility toward developing life. The implications for public morality arise from recognition of the different nature of the two decisions. The abortion decision constitutes a prismatic case for the social morality of a society. What is involved is the right to life of a weak and vulnerable needy neighbor. As Prof. Ralph B. Potter has poignantly observed, the fetus symbolizes the human situation of each person: we are all in varying degrees dependent upon each other, and the quality of life we share is related to the respect we have for that dependence.[5] When abortion decisions are viewed as issues of private morality, i.e., decisions in which there is no public interest at stake, the protection of human rights in society is substantially threatened. It is easy to recognize the rights of the strong; only a morally sensitive society recognizes and supports the rights of the weak.

In drawing the distinction between abortion and other forms of contraception on the grounds of public morality, the Church strengthens the case it is presently trying to make in society on abortion and it highlights a factor which has been systematically overlooked in our cultural shift on abortion. To specify the abortion decision as a case of public morality is to assert that because the rights of the fetus are involved, the society has an interest in how the decision is made; failure to protect the rights of anyone has implications for everyone. We ignore the abuse of the rights of others at the peril of someday having our own rights ignored.

Opposition to abortion in any form, but especially abortion as a public policy, on the grounds of public morality, is the strongest argument the Church can make to the charge that it seeks to impose its morality on others. If it can be shown that the public interest is involved because issues on rights are at stake, then the case against abortion as an isolated act or as a public policy is not a "sectarian" position. Moreover, in casting the abortion argument in this form - the rights of the fetus as a public issue - the Church specifies a significant moral factor which is not being weighed in the arguments about public policy.

This discussion of the abortion issue has served to move us from the means issue to the rights issue. The stance the Church takes against abortion as a means of population policy should be only one part of a broader position which casts the moral argument about population in terms of a human-rights genre of argument. To base our moral critique of population policy on a means argument is defective on two counts: substantively, it looks at only one relatively minor dimension of population policy; strategically, it tends to isolate us, leaving us without allies on an issue where Catholics alone cannot carry the case, nationally or internationally.

Conversely, to base our critique of population policy in terms of a human-rights argument allows us to take a systemic view of population policy, i.e., analyze the principles which guide the direction and implementation of policy, and offers us an opportunity to join forces with others who also have raised wuestions about the morality of population policy here

[5] R. Potter, "The Abortion Debate," in D. Cutler, ed. Updating Life and Death (Boston: Beacon, 1969) pp. 85 - 134.

and abroad. Our evaluation of population policy should not be only in terms of a critique, but where we have to make a critique it should be carried out under the rubric of human rights.

The purpose of a human-rights evaluation of population policy would be to guarantee that any measures adopted serve not only the common interests of the larger society but also respect the personal rights of individuals who make up the society. The essence of the population problem is the need to balance the aggregate interests of society in maintaining a proper balance of resources and people with the personal rights of the individual to marry and to determine family size.

The style of systemic moral thinking which seeks to accord proper weight to the "common good" while recognizing that the "common good is chiefly guaranteed when personal rights and duties are maintained" (_Pacem in terris_, no. 60) is part of the Catholic social tradition as best expressed in modern papal teaching. To move from a means argument to a rights argument on population policy is to remain very much in a Catholic style and structure of moral reasoning. It is to move, however, from a particularistic to a universalist mode of argumentation.

Prof. Arthur Dyck, in his discussion of the nature of the right to have children, describes it as a "fundamental right" which an ideal observer would recognize as being universally valid, "belonging to every human being _qua_ human being."[6] A human-rights style of argument places the Church in the service of all individuals and thereby elicits the cooperation of others similarly concerned about such fundamental rights. The shape of the argument defending such fundamental rights against unjust intrusion by a public authority would follow the lines of Pope John's discussion in _Pacem in terris_ of the relationship between individuals and public authorities in a state. The specifics of such an argument cannot be easily summarized but among the benefits of adopting such a style of moral reasoning are the following: 1) we broaden the scope and basis of our moral reasoning on the population issue, speaking in defense of each person against unjustified restriction of a basic right; 2) in this process we strengthen the defense of the Catholic conscience in the face of policies it might find particularly offensive, e.g., sterilization; 3) we avoid the charge of a "sectarian" stance by arguing in categories and for principles which stand apart from any single faith perspective.

The need for such a human-rights posture on population policy is evident both on the national and on the international levels of the debate. The pressure of the population problem tends to emphasize the need to stress systemic over personal values.[7] The first to be affected by such thinking are often those in society without power to protect their rights. In evaluating the impact of incentives and compulsion as instruments of policy planning, Dyck finds that "Compulsion, like incentives, discriminates against the poor. Restricting the very poor to two or three children would render their lives much less hopeful and much more precarious. In less developed countries such restrictions for the poor mean economic losses in the form of reductions both in labor and in security for their old age."[8]

---

[6] Dyck, op. cit., p. 77

[7] For a discussion of some of the ethical issues involved in the mix of systemic and personal aspects of public morality, see M. Longwood, "The Common Good: An Ethical Framework for Evaluating Environmental Issues," Theological Studies 34 (1973) 468-80.

The theme of this quotation indicates the final utility of a human-rights approach to population policy for the Church. Current research on population policy has given us a better appreciation of the complex relationship between development and population.[9] The necessary role of development policies for any successful population policy is now more widely appreciated. The Church has sought through her recent teaching to articulate a theory of the rights involved in the development process. She now needs to complement this theory of rights with a theory of rights for population policy, one which takes the problem seriously, legitimates and encourages public action, but also correlates this with personal and familial freedom.

POLICY, PEDAGOGY, AND PASTORAL CARE

Thus far we have discussed possible substantive positions which the Church might assume in the Population Year. A complementary strategic consideration is to assess the potential of the Church to reach audiences with a message about the Population Year. Her potential influence is linked in part with the channels she has at her disposal to transmit information, evaluation, and opinion. Three structural characteristics of the Church, nationally and internationally, are pertinent to this assessment of her potential: her educational ministry, her transnational presence, and her pastoral access to people.

The significance of the Church's educational system, understood both as schools and as religious education, becomes evident as the multidimensional character of the population question becomes clearer in the public mind. Factors influencing peoples' ideas on fertility include notions of sexuality, sexual identity, family, the role of women in society, and the age best suited for marriage. The formative ideas people receive about these concepts and the links that are drawn from these personal issues to the larger social questions concerning demographic and socioeconomic factors can make a substantial long-range impact on the fertility patterns in society. What is taught in Catholic schools must obviously be determined by our own values and beliefs on these questions. But there are creative possibilities for influence through the Catholic schools system, because we can deal there with basic themes which affect fertility and we are forming the most important decision-makers about fertility patterns: the individual couple who will enter marriage.

On a very different level of the population question the Church has another form of presence. Political scientists refer to the Church as a transnational actor, i.e., an institution which cuts across sovereign states and which exercises a systemic or global influence. There are only a handful of institutions in the world which possess this kind of presence; it carries with it a unique potential for action. The Church is simultaneously a transnational or universal institution and also a national body, since it takes shape within each state. The dimensions of the population policy are global in scope, but the decisions about policy are made by sovereign states. The Church possesses the potential to influence the global shape of the problem and also the specific decisions of national actors. Few other institutions have the opportunity to function at these two levels.

---

[8] Dyck, op. cit., p. 79

[9] See, e.g. W. Rich, Population Explosion: The Role of Development, Overseas Development Council, Communique no. 16: see also Population Memoranda of the Center of Concern.

Finally, few other institutions possess the access to peoples' lives, consciences, feelings, and beliefs the way the Church does in its daily pastoral work. One of the difficulties of setting population policy is that we are dealing with a macro-level of reality, but the decisions affecting reality are made at the micro-level of personal choice about family size. It is difficult to translate the macro-dimensions of the question into the personal perceptions of individuals. The Church is involved in the macro-questions through her social and moral teaching. But it is also involved in the micro-level of peoples' lives through its pastoral care. If the Church can correlate its action on these two levels, it can exercise a singularly valuable influence on a question with immense personal and policy implications.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

[A substantial portion of this address has appeared in Theological Studies, Vol. 35, No. 1, March 1974 under the title, "The Church and the Population Year: Notes on a Strategy" pp. 71 - 82. It is reproduced here with the permission of the editor.]

Rev. J. Bryan Hehir
Associate Secretary
International Office for Justice and Peace
U.S. Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC   20005

WHAT IS POPULATION?

Dr. Leon Bouvier

This morning I plan to discuss Population Education but with emphasis on its demographic aspects. While there are nuances in the various definitions of population education, the one developed by NCEA is appropriate.

"Population Education, as defined by the NCEA/CC Task Force, is the process by which an individual explores: (1) the nature of population characteristics and variables; (2) the causes of population change; and (3) the implications of these phenomena for the individual, the family, society, and the world.

This population education process is envisioned as a systematic learning experience which reflects upon: (a) population characteristics, such as: age, sex, race, religion, dependency ratio, distribution; and (b) population variables: fertility, mortality, and migration patterns."

Population Education as such is not to be confused with sex education, or ecology education, though they are admittedly related to one another. There are some scholars who feel that population education and ecology should be taught together, but most of us are in agreement that sex education is somewhat different and should be handled differently. Population education is more than a demographic approach to better understand the implications of changes in numbers - changes that could result in decreases as well as increases. But being a demographer, I will concentrate on that dimension of the subject of population; other speakers I assume will discuss other aspects of the subject.

Population education should be introduced into the school curriculum not because people see it as a problem but because it is inherently important to have a better understanding of the subject itself. I hope I can give you some examples of this importance this morning. However, we should bear in mind that we cannot really consider population in isolation from the other issues to which it is related. For example, how does population growth relate to food resources. The real issue is, how to achieve a better life for all human beings on the planet. In that case, obviously, population growth rates must be considered in so far as they relate to the scarcity or plentifulness of resources. But let's get to the demographic part of population education. Some of this is quite familiar to you. I was just looking over some of the materials that have been made available to you and it was my first opportunity to read Sr. Thelma Wurzelbacher's article. If you haven't already read it, I suggest you do so.

The whole issue of population growth on the planet has become a matter of serious concern to most serious thinkers. It took us hundreds of thousands of years to reach the first billion mark in about 1830.

We are now at about four billion. In other words, we added 3 billion people in about 145 years. The U.S. grew about 5 million in 1790 to the present 215 million in about 180 years. But the Third World has been the major contributor to growth in recent decades. Its proportion of the population of the world, which in the 19th century was less than 50%, is now about 75%. Right now we are adding about 80 to 85 million people per year to the planet and about 4 out of 5 live in the less developed countries. The enormity of this annual growth is awesome to consider. It amounts to 220 thousand per day, 9200 per hour, 155 per minute and about 3 per second. I should add that this is the net growth - i.e. births minus deaths. But why this enormous growth all of a sudden when for thousands of years, numerical increases were scarcely observable? Before trying to answer that question, we should consider the concept of exponential growth. It is vital that we thoroughly understand its implication. A 2% rate of growth means that the population doubles in about 35 years. A 1% rate of growth results in a doubling in 70 years. But as time goes on, the base population itself keeps getting larger and larger. Thus the number that is doubling becomes increasingly greater. When considering the planet there are only two ways the population can change - people are either born or they die. For parts of the planet, like the U.S., there is also migration. For the planet it is very simple to figure out the rate of growth. We look at the estimated birth rates and death rates. The birth rate is about 33 per thousand and the death rate 13 per thousand. By a simple subtraction it is obvious that the growth rate is 2 percent or 20 per 1000. This means a doubling of the population in about 35 years - at this present rate.

Let's look at the three processes themselves - to explain, very briefly, why the world population increased from 1 billion to 4 billion so rapidly. We start with mortality rather than fertility because mortality decline was the primary cause of the rapid rate of growth that has taken place since the 19th century. Life expectancy in the U.S. in the late 19th century was around 45 or 50 years. It is now about 71 years. In less developed countries life expectancy is still low - about 50 years but even there it has increased somewhat. We have had a long-term mortality decline and I will discuss what the implications of this are in a moment. Fertility also has been dropping but fertility inevitably waits until after mortality declines before it begins its descent. In other words, a demographic transition took place at least in the western world. It was a transition from an era of high birth and death rates to one of high birth and declining death rates to the present situation where both birth and death rates are quite low.

For thousands of years there was a very low rate of growth because of high mortality and of course even higher fertility. For example, death rates generally exceeded 35 per 1,000, fertility about 40 or 45 per 1,000. The present situation in advanced countries suggests a new kind of balance of low mortality and low fertility - the former usually below 10 per 1,000; the latter about 15-18 per 1000. In both instances, there is a balance. Between the two "balances", imbalance contributed to a rapid rate of growth. Most of the less developing countries are presently in the "imbalance" stage.

Migration is the third process that is applicable to smaller areas of the planet and I would like to consider this briefly. In many instances you will find in teaching population education that migration is a very, very important local dimension. For those of you who live in this area, consider the incredible suburbanization process which has taken place. Migration also means the emptying out of areas. In the U.S., while we have gained 60 million people in the 25 years since 1950, over half of our counties lost population - an amazing phenomenon. The rural sections of the Plains States keep losing population (many of the counties in South Dakota, Nebraska and Montana are practically empty) while the large metropolitan areas keep growing. Migration is the great contributing factor. Teachers in the high schools located in areas losing population will find it difficult to convince students that population growth can be a problem on this planet. They will perhaps be more interested in learning why the people leave the farms and its effects on the area itself. Clearly then we must consider migration - internal and international.

These are the three demographic processes. Now let us see how the processes and the changes in these processes affect the composition of the population. How do changes in mortality, fertility or migration affect the structure of the population? And by structure I mean its proportion by age and sex. What is the proportion under fifteen years old, 65 and over? What is the sex ratio? Let's look at mortality, fertility and migration and see how they affect the structure of the population. If you live in an area where 50% of the people are 65 or older, it is quite different from one in which 50% are 15 years and younger. For example, St. Petersburg, Florida is different from the Bronx in its age structure. This leads to all kinds of different occupations; different kinds of problems (I expect juvenile delinquency is very low in St. Petersburg). But this all results from changes in mortality, fertility and migration. So first of all let's look at how a society ages - that is, has the proportion of elderly increased or decreased: what causes the median age to vary. Many people assume that our society is "aging" because individuals live longer. Sad to say, this is not true. The main contributor to the aging of society is declining fertility. In the U.S., for example, the median age is about 29. Most projections suggest that if the present very low fertility is maintained, the median age will go up to about 35-36 probably by the turn of the century. Our improvements in mortality have not been so much in the older ages as in the younger ages. In other words, when you see mortality improve it is infant mortality that drops first. There is little evidence of any major improvement in the life expectancy of people 50 years or older. Ironically, as infant mortality declines the median moves down because the infants who would have died in a previous era remain alive and contribute to more people of young ages. So what you have therefore is a very complicated relationship between fertility and mortality and the age of a society. Sweden, for example, has had low fertility and low mortality for many years. Its median age is around 35 or so. Consider the difference between the population whose median age is about 35 and one whose median age is about 25 - or in less developed countries - 20 or 18 or 15.

Let's look at the less developed countries for a moment. In those areas fertility remains quite high and infant mortality has declined somewhat leading to a "younging" of the population. Consider then the tremendous potential for growth where you have this enormous number of young people who have made it through the difficult years and approach adulthood. Consider too the problems such an age structure implies for education and the economy. On the other hand an aging population has problems too. They will often be more conservative. A large proportion of elderly can have a debilitating effect on social security systems. Migration also contributes to changes in the age and sex structure of a population. Interestingly, as we improve our health situation the sex ratio declines. Early in the 20th century the sex ratio in the U.S. was a little over 100; there were about 102 men for 100 women. By 1970, it was 95 men to 100 women; by 2000 it will probably have dropped to 90. The point is that women benefit more than men from improvements in medicine. Mortality declines contribute to a declining sex ratio.

Let us consider for a moment one of the practical applications of population education. Let us look at the elderly. We have 25 million people 65 or over in the U.S. right now. By the turn of the century, say 2010, we will have 40 million aged. We do not know what proportion of the population that will be as that depends on fertility; it will perhaps represent around 15%. But we know there will definitely be around 40 million people 65 and over. They are already here. But what are we as a nation doing about it? Very little, I'm afraid. How are we planning to solve the problems that will emerge when the number of aged double? This is the kind of very valuable information that comes from population education. We all know the problems we went through in the 50's as a result of the baby boom. The proportion in the school ages was enormous. The relationships between the demographic processes and every aspect of life are overwhelming and I am really convinced that educated citizens must have some knowledge of the implications, whatever they may be.

So far I have talked about growth and the demographic process. The citizens of St. Petersburg are pretty well able to take care of themselves, but what about other areas which have a large elderly population - not because the old are moving there to retire, but because the young adults are leaving because they can't find any jobs. The proportion in, say, Mills County, Texas or Armstrong County, South Dakota of people 65 or older is as high in St. Petersburg, but for the opposite reason; children grow up, go to school, get out. So you have a lot of old people. What about this situation? You see this in the older cities of the East, especially in the white population where death rates are as high as birth rates because there are so many old people. Whenever the death rates are as high as the birth rates, we can assume that there is a peculiar age structure. Pittsburgh has already reached a negative natural growth among the white population - not among the black population which is much younger - but among the white population of the inner city.

We can talk about growth and we can see a decline in population in some areas but what about population equilibrium. What about "Zero Population Growth" - a term which has been used a lot in the last decade or so. What does ZPG mean? I would like to go into that because it is so important. For one thing we are close to ZPG in the U.S. and also it is a term which is bandied about in the press to a great extent.

The term ZPG is often misunderstood. There is a simple definition and a complex definition of ZPG. The simple definition is that all people should have two children and no more - and that ends population growth. But let's look at it in a little more detail. Interestingly, the world has been at ZPG for most of its history. After all, if it took us half-a-million years to reach one billion, obviously we weren't growing much. It averages out to .00005 per year, so we were almost at ZPG for most of our history. Birth rates and death rates were about even. But women had perhaps 10-12 children. The important point is that only about two survived to adulthood. You may have seen the magic figure 2.11 used a lot. This is supposed to mean ZPG: why 2.11 and not 2.0? 2.11 is the number of children a woman has to have to result in one female child living to have another female child. So why the 2.11? Because there are more male than females born. And also because all females do not live to the reproductive point in life. So 2.11 translates to 1.0 female living to reproduce herself. 2.11 is not a magic number - it is the present "magic" number for the U.S. In less developed countries, or in the distant past alluded to earlier, to end up with 1 female replacing herself you needed about 4 or 5 females (or 10 births) because so many died before reaching reproductive age. Another thing to consider is that the U.S. is presently below ZPG (about 1.86) which means that if women keep reproducing as they are right now, they will have had 1.86 children, on the average, when their families are completed. This translates to about .9 females. However, even if they do continue having such small families, we would still add 60 million people before the population levelled off, assuming no international migration.

Why is it that it will take us 50 or 60 years to attain real ZPG if we continue having less than two children. It is precisely because of the age structure. After World War II fertility went up. For ten or twelve years the three to four child family was popular. That means there are many young people now entering their own stage of life when families are formed. Even if theylimit themselves to two children, they are so numerous that the population will continue to grow for some time.

The ripple effect is important. That's why even with two children we will have additional growth. But consider less developed countries where half their population is under 20 or even 15 and look at their potential for growth. The number of youths is so enormous it would take maybe another 100 years or so, even with only two children, for the population to level off. So the ZPG movement is an interesting concept but it is much more complex than the term implies. It has all kinds of ramifications. For example, if we only had two children, as I mentioned earlier, the median age of our population would go up to about 37-38. That would be one of the results of ZPG.

Now let's look at the present situation in the U.S. We're having under two children and this may keep dropping (and I wouldn't be surprised if it did. This is not the best time economically to raise a family). Let's assume a drop to an average of 1.5 in the next ten years. Obviously, sooner or later population would start declining. But it cannot decline indefinitely for obvious reasons. There would be pressure to restore an equilibrium of some sort. But who will be asked to restore the equilibrium? Young females of that future period. But there would be very few females 20 to 30 years old as these would be the offspring of the present low fertility cohort. What would they have to do to restore fertility? Because there would be so few in number they would have to average over 3 children merely to get back to ZPG.

Now let's look at the future. Here it is important to place population growth in its proper perspective. Many aspects we have discussed stand by themselves. The aging situation; changing age structure. When we look at the global situation, population growth is but one aspect of it. It is not the dependent variable in the hypothesis we are looking at. To me the dependent variable is the developing of a better life for all humans. The world is finite. Where the limits are is difficult to ascertain. On the one hand the big problem lies in developing more food, more resources and distributing them more equitably. On the other hand, the exponential rate of growth of population cannot be allowed to continue for many more years. We have to face the fact that population growth is part of the problem that has to be looked at very seriously and very objectively. It is a major factor in the equation but it is certainly not the only factor in this attempt to improve the lot of man.

The phrase "population explosion" has been consistently used. We have gone from 1 billion to 4 billion in 130 years, and we will undoubtedly reach 8 billion by 2010, or at present rates this could mean 16 billion before 2050. Even if all women of the world average but 2 children from 2000 on, the total population would attain 8 billion before levelling off. But you can't use the phrase "population explosion" and point the finger at the less developed countries without inviting them to point the finger at the advanced countries and shout "consumption explosion." After all, we in the U.S. comprise only 5% of the population and consume well over 40% of the resources of the planet and this may be increasing. The "consumption explosion" is also part of the much broader issue we have to consider here. I would hope that as you look into this matter more deeply that you consider the broader issues of politics, ethics, and every other aspect of this major problem facing mankind. And I hope that you will try to develop an approach and that you will try to understand and respect the views of many people who have done a lot of work in this field. All of them have something to offer and I think you have to look at the consensus view as you look at the major problem itself. (But you don't have to agree with all of them; I sure don't agree with many of them.)

I think we have to consider both, the aspect of population growth and the aspect of consumption growth - both I feel have to be tempered if indeed by the year 2000 we do succeed in attaining the goal which is really a decent life for all human beings on the planet.

Dr. Leon Bouvier
Vice President, Population Reference Bureau, Inc.
1754 N St., NW
Washington, DC 20036

FOOD AND POPULATION: A NEW WORLDVIEW NEEDED

Gerald E. Connolly

There can be little doubt today that the world we knew in the 1960's has radically changed. No longer can we view it, as Americans, in dichotomized terms of capitalist versus Communist, or even poor versus rich. Our former geo-political world view now serves as but a curious anomaly. Mr. Nixon's visit to Peking in 1972 added an entirely new dimension to our concept of detente and forced American policymakers to rethink and to recast our previous monolithic approaches to communist societies. The events last year in Portugal had immediate impact in the political realignment of Africa which in turn has had repercussions even on our NATO alliance. The cartel phenomenon that included iron ore, bauxite, copper and of course oil has recently added yet another raw material to its political bargaining - that of coffee.

We Americans have had a rude awakening these past three years in our concepts and understandings of the order of things. The rules we helped fashion immediately after the second World War have been changed and we seem to have great difficulty in coping with this most recent dynamic. By our rules, for example, a poor nation just like a poor individual, works its way up the economic ladder through diligence, perseverance, hard work and sound business practices. Usually it ought to include alluring investment opportunities as well. But as Charles Maynes recently pointed out the OPEC nations have permanently obviated that view of the way things ought to work. In one week last year the OPEC nations set into motion a price increase that eventually measured 300% for the cost of a barrel of crude oil, slapped an embargo on several industrialized nations for their political support of the State of Israel, and began the process of accruing more wealth than any one decision had generated in human history in such a brief span of time.

In the scramble to reevaluate policies pursuant to these global shifts in power and international relationships, Americans have begun to understand that food, its production and distribution, will have a great part to play on the global stage of events in this the last quarter of the 20th century. Food is the one raw material we have in relative abundance. It is the one essential raw material for which there is universal need. For we cannot understand the current world food shortage until we grasp some of the operative dynamics involved in the long-term resolution of endemic hunger. There simply will be no ultimate resolution of the hunger problem, globally, without a commensurate attempt to meet the other socio-economic variables that interplay with its prevalence. Population is but one of many such variables that affects global food supplies and food demand.

ROOTS OF THE CURRENT FOOD CRISIS:

Paralleling these shifts in the international political order, there has been a significant and precipitous decline in the availability of world grains since 1972, the consequences of which may yield unprecedented famine and social dislocation in large parts of the world. The fact is that we now have the lowest grain reserves since World War II's end. 1974 witnessed an actual and absolute decline in total world food production of about 2%. Coupled with an approximate global population growth of 2% this constitutes a 4% net deficit in world food this year; a fact that poses profoundly disturbing questions to each and every one of us.

Partially, the current world food crisis can be attributed to natural causes interacting with very human causal factors. The Peruvian anchovy catch, for example, represents almost one fifth of the total world fish catch. In 1973 the Peruvian anchovy catch collapsed. After peaking at 12 million tons, the 1973 catch totaled a bare 2 million tons of anchovy. Many scientists and ecologists ascribe this very alarming development directly to overfishing off the Peruvian coast. In many ways the Peruvian experience has been a microcosm of the global situation. After nearly 30 consecutive years of growth in which the global fish catch trebled from 21 to 70 million tons a year, the world fish yields have declined each year for the past three years. Many scientists have postulated that in addition to the poisonous effects of sea pollution and massive waste discharges in the oceans, we may have reached the maximum level of fish reproduction - certainly not encouraging news for a hungry world.

Weather and its vagaries have taken a toll on food production. The all-important Asian monsoons have been erratic these last few years. 1972 was a particularly bad year in this respect. Extreme winter conditions severely damaged Soviet wheat crops and widespread droughts occurred in large parts of Africa, Australia, India, Bangladesh and China that year, completely divesting the world of its 1971 grain reserves.

Despite some very real gains in total grain production in 1973, the world finds itself in a precarious state in 1974 with a summer drought in the United States farm-belt and actual drops in the production of key crops worldwide. This year total world grain production has fallen by 25 million tons; world rice fell by an estimated 2 million tons and feed grains fell by over 11 million tons. The impact of these statistics on human life can best be demonstrated with an image conjured up by Dr. Norman Borlaug. Describing total world grain consumption, which is growing by 30 million metric tons each year, Dr. Borlaug has stated that the 1.2 billion metric tons of world grain consumption represents an amount that is enough to "build a highway around the earth's equator 55 feet wide and six feet deep. But unlike macadam which lasts thirty years, this road has to be rebuilt every year."

All of the natural causes notwithstanding, the present crisis in food stuffs availability is profoundly affected by human behavior and by political decisions made in developed and developing countries alike.

Take the sub-Sahara region of Africa known as the Sahel. Experts now know that this region of the African continent, stretching some 3500 miles across, has a very fragile eco-system that has been severely damaged over the past thirty years. Human and livestock populations have nearly doubled there in the past three decades. Overgrazing and large scale deforestation have laid barren the precious soils of the Sahel and as a result the Sahara desert has advanced southward by up to 30 miles a year. With the terrible drought and falling water tables livestock have been depleted by 70 and 80% in many regions. Whole villages and nomad tribes have been forced to flee in the Sahara's wake and literally millions of people have been faced with the threat of starvation. Rhodesia has announced a plan to regularly seed clouds in order to increase its local rainfall by about 10% - a move some meteorologists suggest may further damage the prospects of recovery for Rhodesia's neighbors. And Nigeria, a nation fortunate with natural resources and some oil revenues, has announced a massive two-decade public works project aimed at stopping any further desert encroachment on its borders by the planting of some 6 billion trees. The lesson of the Sahel seems to be that human decisions, planning (or lack of it) can have a major and pervasive impact on our eco-system in general and on food output in particular.

Much has been made of the fact that the OPEC decision to dramatically raise oil prices has had deeply harmful effects on the ability of the poorer nations to increase or even maintain their agricultural production levels. Fertilizer prices have skyrocketed. Many vital agricultural commodities, necessary in the production of food, are in scarce supply.

Little concomitant attention has been paid, however, to the political decisions and policies that have had equally adverse effects on reserves and on the third world capacity to increase food production. The great Russian Grain robbery of 1972 is a case in point. Because of a very bad winter and a series of crop failures, the U.S.S.R. was facing an acute shortage of feedgrains in 1972. In past years the Soviets solved such problems by slaughtering large parts of its herds. But like so many other developed societies, the Soviet people have become accustomed to eating red meat. Rather than eliminate beef from its menu, the Soviets chose to go on the world market early and buy up large quantities of grain at relatively modest prices. In this quiet fashion American grain companies were only too accommodating to Russian demands and quietly sold them 422 million bushels of wheat, a deal that represented the largest single grain purchase in human history. All of us know the ending to this story, grain speculators thereafter helped push the prices of cereals on world markets to new highs, world grain reserves were depleted, and the U.S. government, caught off guard by the deal, wondered about possible controls about future exports of such magnitude.

It seems no accident that during the Nixon administration the U.S. has rid itself of costly and inefficient surpluses of grain that previously had been used to feed hungry nations - $25 billion worth over the post-war period. We also freed up to 50 million acres of idled crop land, one of the last vestiges of "reserve" the world had up until 1972. Not all of this land, however, was turned into useful food-grain purposes. In fact not only the United States, but Canada and Australia had actually cut their total acreage of wheat production. Between 1968 and 1970 total wheat acreage in the U.S. was cut from 22.4 million hectares to 17.6 million hectares. Canada reduced its wheat production from 11.9 to 5.1 hectares and Australia from 10.8 to 6.4 million hectares of wheat production. All of this suggests some collusion among the big three wheat producers to help drive up sagging wheat prices - a strategy, which planned or unplanned, has worked all too well by mid-decade.

Helping to feed the world has become a profitable venture indeed for the United States. Over the past four years our agricultural products exported have grown from $8 to $22 billion a year worth of sales. At the same time our humanitarian food assistance programs have for all practical purposes and intents been gutted. This year the U.S. food aid program will feed only 45.6 million people compared to last fiscal year's 63.5 million people - a cut of one/third at a time when the numbers of chronically hungry and malnourished people have swelled worldwide. Current food aid tonnage from the U.S. is only half of what it was in the mid 1960's.

THE POPULATION VARIABLE:

It is an undeniable fact that current rates of population growth exacerbate the growing problem of food scarcity in many parts of the globe. Each year we add another 76 million people to the earth's tables. A great deal of hay has been made by Armageddon-like talk of the stalking ghost of Malthus raising his ugly head over an overpopulated, famine-ridden world where only the rich and fat will survive. Popular writers like William Paddock and Garret Hardin have gone so far as to suggest that the U.S. abandon all efforts to help the poorer nations because their population growth rates preclude any real possibility of hope or future progress. In fact, they assert, such assistance will measurably harm our own future ability to survive and prevail. It is an unfortunate development in this country that such doomsdayers receive widespread credence and support.

Up until this year, as a matter of fact, world population growth has not outstripped our capacity to increase food production. In that respect it is to be hoped that 1974 was an aberration in an otherwise steady trend towards measurably higher grain yields even in the poorer nations themselves.

But what of this population variable? It is clear to me that Americans have a tendency in their analysis of this phenomenon to ascribe to it the terms of a problem to be solved. A sine qua non, if you will, to be solved prior to any real social-economic advancement in the poorer societies. Such an analysis also has an inbuilt prejudice towards pure quantitative, statistical terms. But population growth represents a nexus of human decisions which may or may not be subject to governmental intervention by way of family planning measures. One thing has been learned from available data of family planning experience over the past decade or so; namely, that fertility declines can be anticipated when a certain modicum of economic, health and social opportunities has been achieved on a relatively broad scale in a given society. In other words it would seem that fertility decline is somewhat contingent on socio-economic progress. When a couple can be secure in the knowledge that their children will not succumb to diseases (often the consequence of chronic malnutrition), for instance. And when, for example, the role of women is defined in such a way that a mother or wife knows she has options that yield social approval other than that of motherhood primarily. China has apparently stabilized her population precisely because there has been economic advancement of a kind that reaches into the tiniest of hamlets, there has been a revolutionary growth in the availability of health services with a medical corps of 1.4 million barefoot paramedics, and women have achieved a status never before possible in pre-Mao China.

None of this is to suggest that family planning programs should be curtailed or dismissed as outright failures. What I do want to assert, however, is that family planning alone - or putting an absolute primacy on the widest possible distribution of family planning information and means is not the answer to population stabilization. At this point I would further add that we need to exorcise from our vocabulary the term "population control." Certainly when a person hears such a term he can justify a negative inference. He might also infer from such a term some sort of involuntary "control" program in the future. I would argue from my own experience at the Bucharest Population Conference that such an inference merely serves to heighten Thirld World suspicions of the nature of our concern in the industrialized societies for what we have myopically defined all too often as "their problem."

The other reality to be faced here is the fact that no matter what is achieved in this last quarter of a century it seems inevitable that the world population will grow to 6 or 7 billion persons by the year 2000. In light of that fact we might as well go about the business of planning for such an increase rather than bemoaning an apparently obvious and inescapable reality. We are going to have to double the number of jobs, houses, food-stuffs and many other things society needs for its functioning. And in the process of planning for and implementing that set of priorities we might also discover the seeds of motivation for smaller families as well. Historically it is true, that in times of famine people tend to have more, not less children as a hedge against ill times. Any genuine attempt at making family planning available to large numbers of people must also be coupled with other social services as well - and health and nutrition services chief among them.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

We can no longer hide from the fact that hunger is a systemic problem. Hunger is closely related to a person's ability to earn adequate income just as it is closely tied to a farmer's ability to sell his product and increase his crop. For the short term, massive amounts of food aid must be provided to stave off the imminent starvation facing millions of people in the poorer nations. In the long term, a whole host of measures will be required - including preferential trade policies for third world nations, new credit terms for food deficit nations, and new aid made available for increased agricultural production especially in the poorer nations hardest hit by food scarcity and energy price increases.

We Americans are in an especially advantageous position because we sit on a mountain of food - actually and potentially - and because our policies greatly influence the future shape of world agriculture. What we do here, what we decide to do or not do may have a direct influence on the future ability of half the world's people to survive. I would like to share with you some suggestions for possible action, immediate and long-range.

1. First, we must pressure Congress and especially the administration for an immediate emergency increase in the current levels of our food aid. Father Hesburgh and others have called for a 4 million ton increase in our PL 480 program to the neediest nations in order to avert imminent starvation. The total world shortfall is estimated by FAO to be somewhere in the vicinity of 8 million metric tons of cereals.

2. The U.S. public should be encouraged to support a large scale non-governmental effort at public education on the issues touching on the food and hunger question. And we should further organize a citizen's common cause against world hunger in order to bring pressure to bear on those governmental policy-makers in order to see to it that the United States has a cohesive national policy on world food.

3. This citizens' group should also pressure government to adhere to the strict use of humanitarian food aid and not for avowedly political purposes alone. Bangladesh was recently told by the U.S. government, for instance, to cancel its pending negotiations with Cuba for the export of Bengali jute - the one item of potential foreign currency for that poor nation - if it wanted U.S. food assistance.

4. The U.S. government ought to initiate a reevaluation of its trade policies aimed at assisting the developing nations by reducing various tariff restrictions on the importation of their manufactured goods, etc.

5. The White House and the Congress be urged to set up a coordinating branch to oversee the implementation of the Rome World Food Recommendations and the U.S. participation in the new International Fund for Agricultural Development and the new World Food Council.

6. That religious bodies, civic groups, business associations and the like encourage their members to reevaluate their lifestyles with a goal to eliminate wasteful practices of consumption and that they be encouraged to tithe themselves, as in days gone by, 1/10th of their annual earnings or at least their food budgets in order to assist those who are hungry and malnourished here in the U.S. and abroad.

These or similar measures should first of all be considered by those of us in the private sector before we urge them as matters for public policy. It seems to me that it is incumbent on those of us engaged in the anti-hunger cause to carefully think through our analysis of the problem before we advocate measures we deem to be vital to its ultimate resolution. But there is no doubt in my own mind of one crying need in the United States and that is for a long-term public education campaign aimed at raising public consciousness concerning these problems and at forging a national policy in response to them. With and only with such a citizens movement will we have constructive U.S. action and will we go a long way towards refashioning our own worldview and our concomitant understanding of our role in the world. In the last analysis it is with such people-to-people actions that man will not only endure but with William Faulkner's vision, someday, he will also prevail.

****

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION:

Q. What is your projection of the economic impact which the production of additional grain for the hungry will have on the United States?

A. The projected economic impact is negligible, if you worry about increased food aid having inflationary impact on food prices here at home. The plan called for by Father Hesburgh proposes that the United States government go into the commercial market and buy grain already there before somebody else gobbles it up. Use it to feed the hungry, rather than have American grain companies buy it and then sell it at higher prices commercially. Part of the problem of scarcity involves a real inflationary factor when outside buyers come into the American market, like the Soviet Union and China. China, for example, this year is going to buy 1.5 billion dollars worth of U.S. agricultural products as opposed to none in 1971; that is a big increase.

Q. It's just a diversion of existing grain stocks, then?

A. Yes, it is a diversion. And the importance for Southeast Asia, and I must include the Indian subcontinent, is that you have to get existing stock to them now. If the government does not buy grain for this purpose, if Ford does not make an executive decision (he has that power by virtue of Congress), by the time they get the grain over to Asia, it will be too late. The time of need in that area of the world, because of their crop schedule, is now. This is the shortfall period, for Asia at least.

Q. There are a growing number of people talking about the need for food export controls. What is your position?

A. I was on a platform at the University of Illinois with Dale Butts, who is head of the Farm Bureau of Indiana, and there were a couple of big grain company representatives who were on the panel discussing this as well. This subject did come up. This had been just subsequent to the Ford panic when we realized that the new Russian wheat deal was in effect; Ford called them in and told them not to do it. For their own benefit, the grain companies need clearcut regulations, because the present situation is really one of arbitrary decision-making. USDA. If it decides an agreement may have an inflationary impact, or may not be good for whatever reason, can call the companies in and say: "No, we are not going to approve this export deal. Well, that is not fair to the grain companies either. You need fair regulations to which we all can adhere. But, it is interesting that six grain companies in the United States control almost 60% of all the grain that the United States trades. And we are responsible for 60% of the world grain traded. That is an awful lot of power in six private hands. They officially espouse laissez-faire: "What we own is our property and we have no right, in terms of public demands, to interfere." I happen to disagree. There is a matter of public interest here, and there have to be some regulations. The problem is that the U.S. Department of Agriculture does not consistently serve the interests of the small farmer; the USDA is the U.S. Department of Agribusiness these days. But until citizens mobilize - and that means a coalition of small farmers, consumers, environmentalists and those of us directly involved in the anti-hunger fight - until we do coalesce to raise public awareness of these issues, we will not have a clear public policy. If the average American is faced with a political decision of selling grain that has to be sold, and you were going to pay more for what you eat anyhow, would you rather have that grain going to feed Soviet cattle or hungry Bengali children? I think the choice would have been very clear to me, and well understood by the American public. But we lack a public forum for that sort of discussion. These concerns are of vital public importance. And there is the question of what role the United States is going to play in the world. Charles Mayne had an article in the Washington Post a few weeks ago, in which he called for a new global ethic. He pointed out that the age of geo-political game playing is over; the vital issues of foreign policy are going to be scarce natural resources. The State Department seems to have a difficult time relating to these phenomena. I believe that the public ought to have a right to monitor our foreign policy with respect to these issues, policies that are made in our name.

Q. Do you think that governmental controls will help cut down on meat and alcohol consumption, freeing up grain?

A. Jean Mayer, the Harvard nutritionist, has raised this issue. But we are never going to have governmental action on that level. It did not work during Prohibition and it is not going to work now. I think in a sense there is a certain spurious quality to this call for people to cut down on meat consumption for example. Bishop O'Rourke of Peoria, former head of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, encouraged the Bishops not to exhort Roman Catholics in the U.S. to lower their consumption of beef. The U.S. Catholic Bishops' Conference was also considering reinstituting meatless Fridays on a voluntary basis. The whole problem with the meat question is simple: is it efficacious? If it is good will for the sake of good will, then to me that is a moral judgment of our efficacy and our ability to effect history. And I would hope that we are more confident of ourselves than that. If a million of us tomorrow were to give up meat either entirely or once a week, and were able to free up that grain, then perhaps the U.S. Army would come in and buy up the glut on the market and feed it, on a patriotic basis, to our soldiers. Or perhaps the USDA would buy up that surplus meat to feed poor people in its domestic food programs. And what good liberal could complain about that? So, the real question at hand is not giving up meat. The first question would be, what are we considering? Is it efficacious? Will it be efficient in the way we want it to be? Let us not dismiss the value, symbolically, of giving up meat. But as long as it remains in the realm of symbolic action, I am not sure how good it really is over the short term, where there is a crying need. And that is why I applaud Father Hesburgh's efforts in calling a press conference on increased food aid, to place pressure on this administration to make a decision. Unfortunately,President Ford did not make a decision. He was considering an increase of up to $1.4 billion in emergency food aid. Even that may not be enough. That is not to say that the whole burden should be on the United States; it should not. But with regard to this question, we came away from the Rome Food Conference with egg on our faces. We called for the conference. When I was a member of the U.S. delegation in Bucharest, Romania, we were instructed that whenever the question arose of the United States increasing its assistance, we were to respond by saying: "Well, we have done our fair share and we are certainly willing to continue to do our fair share, but we feel that it is time for the new rich to inject and infuse massive doses of badly needed capital for such programs." In Rome we said that, and to our surprise many of the new rich, including Iran, "anted up" and said: " Fine. We will make a commitment in dollars." And we were not able to match the amount of that commitment in food aid. Our resource right now is food. This calls to mind the need for monitoring how our foreign policy is made in our name. What American had anything to say about who was or was not chosen to represent us in the U.S. Delegation? This may seem like a fatuous issue, to my mind it is not. Non-governmental organizations were told that they could have no representation on the U.S. Delegation to the Rome Food Conference. At the last minute, a friend of President Ford, the Vice President of the Kellogg Company of Battle Creek, Michigan, was added as a non-governmental organization participant to the U.S. Delegation. This was a complete surprise to both Secretary Butz and Secretary Kissinger. This is a rather haphazard way of choosing the people who will represent us. We have to open up that process. Widespread debate on these issues should be encouraged. Maybe it is not efficacious to encourage Americans voluntarily or even by law to cut down their grain consumption. This did happen, however, in 1947 when President Truman put ceilings on how much alcohol could be produced precisely to see how many people would do without. In 1918, when Hoover directed the American Relief Agency for Post World War I Europe, by voluntary action in one year 7.5 million tons of grain were freed up from domestic use in the United States to feed hungry people in Europe. We are calling for 4 million tons when our food production is monumental compared to what it was in 1918. It seems to me that the crime of this administration is, to use their term, "waffling" on this crucial decision.

Q. Do you think that if the government will not do it, the people should be encouraged to donate food directly?

A. I would not want to get involved in advocating that sort of thing because it gets sticky. Anyone who has traveled to Africa or Bangladesh knows that at least 50% of the problem is also distribution: trying to get food to where it is needed. It gets tied down in red tape. It gets involved in black markets. Transportation to the outlying areas most in need becomes impossible during certain times of the year. And during the times that are favorable for transport, there are all sorts of problems: bad roads, breakdown of equipment, no mechanics, no garages. Air lifts become difficult. The price of airline fuel has shot up in the last year, by 400 and 500 percent in some areas of the Sahel, which makes it very expensive indeed to airlift emergency food. Americans have pumped $25 billion worth of food aid since World War II into the world. And since that is our money, we ought to ask ourselves why there are more hungry people today than ever before. Clearly, the answer in the long term is not food aid. In the short term it is. As people who define ourselves by certain ethical codes, we cannot afford to live with millions of people starving. We do have some responsibility, either as Christians or as people concerned on a humanitarian level. We must begin to rethink our world view. We must begin to understand the root causes of hunger, and I do not pretend to stand up here and tell you all the root causes of world hunger. But it is my suspicion, just as with the so-called "population problem," that there is a terrible wrong in the simple existence of 400 million chronically malnourished people. FAO advises us that the number is actually going to double in the next five years, to 800 million. There has to be a terrible wrong within a system or systems which sustains that sort of reality. Anyone who is concerned in defining himself or herself as an ethical human being wants, I am sure, to transform that reality. But I do think that it is going to require massive doses of resources, and diverting resources from present uses. I cannot think of a more corrosive element in society than hunger. If you cannot feed people in your society, then your society has a very bleak future indeed. Food is the most basic societal building block, the most basic security a society has to offer. Donating food is fine as a symbolic action, and it can have impact. All of us remember the 1971 recession when a Japanese town sent "care" packages to Seattle, Washington. The psychological impact on the American psyche of our being a recipient of aid was interesting to read and watch. I am sure that in other societies there might be such a similar impact. But that alone, in my opinion, will not solve the problem. And we have to understand absolutely that it is a band-aid measure. Sometimes you need a band-aid but that will not solve the long-term problem.

Q. Why don't those hungry people in the food-poor nations control their birth rate, so they can feed themselves? Why is it that these countries' economies are not capable of growing in a measurable way, nor their governments capable of educating their populations in the intricacies and need for that? Another comment is with reference to John Chancellor's program last October, when he implied that it was just as difficult to persuade people in India or Africa or elsewhere to reduce the number of their children, to change their lifestyle and their cultural values, as it is to persuade our own population to change its value and lifestyle. When people say: "Why don't they stop having so many children," the response can be: "Why don't you change your life style and reduce your birth rate?" It is just as difficult for us to make that adjustment as it is for them. And

I think it is important to understand that population alone is not the problem.

A. I couldn't agree with you more.

Q. I wonder if you would expand a little about what kinds of bodies provide input for policy decisions by the White House and Congress, and how the White House and Congress made the decision about implementing the World Food Congress and how they coordinate with the U.N. action on the world food crisis.

A. Four or five years ago no upcoming young Congressman from an urban area would ever want to sit on the House Agricultural Committee, likewise the Senate Agricultural Committee. It was the rural few who really exerted enormous power over domestic food programs. But this year young Congressmen and Congresswomen even from urban areas are vying for a seat on House Agriculture, and even Senate Agriculture. And you have a whole host of various congressional committees that are in one fashion or another concerned with this problem. You have the Senate Agriculture Committee, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, even Kennedy's Committee on Refugees. On the House side, you have the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Agriculture Committee, etc. But all of them want to get into the act, because the media have made food a major issue today. The involvement and interest in the Rome Food Conference on the part of Congress was extraordinary. At the Population Conference in Bucharest, we had trouble getting congressional people to come. Senator Charles Percy flew in and flew out, on his way to a vacation; he was there two days. Congresswoman Edith Green, now retired, was the only other congressional representative on the delegation. And that was it. The Republican slot switched hands several times and ended up going to Charles Sandman; he was busy fighting for reelection in New Jersey and didn't bother coming. Well, in Rome it was hard to keep them away. There must have been twenty or thirty Congresspersons plus staff people at the Rome Food Conference. And they are all interested in this issue, because it is one of burning political concern. For that reason, there is a need of some congressional ad hoc coordinating system to at least inform the various committees what each is doing. The U.N. system contains hundreds of various committees and ad hoc groups that you have to go through. And Congress does not understand it all. So there is a definite need for some coordinating branch to keep Congress informed. How will the World Food Council relate to ECOSOC, to the UNGA; likewise, the International Fund for Agricultural Development? And how will the White House link up? These questions have not yet been answered. In 1961 when President Kennedy took office, his friend George McGovern had really gone down to the wire for him in South Dakota and, of course, lost in his Senate bid in 1961. So Kennedy named McGovern Food for Peace Director out of the White House, which was interesting because there was a Food for Peace Program that was run out of AID and had its own administrator. McGovern acted as the promoter of public interest in this Food for Peace program and was able to get an awful lot of public support for that program. He gave speeches and acted as a coordinator, which proved to be a very effective sort of function, and McGovern did it well. It would seem that a White House counterpart to AID would also by useful today because if anyone has had to deal with the White House since last June, they know that it is hard to get a decision from them. It is very difficult to understand who really is making policy. For example, at Rome Kissinger wanted to give a very eloquent speech on behalf of the U.S. Delegation to the Rome Food Conference, and was cabled here from Washington by Bill Simon and Roy Ash that his speech was unacceptable. Some postulate policy is made by conspiracy, because Butz apparently did a complete 180 degree turn on the question of food aid. He had initially signed a cable from the delegation asking Ford for an increase in food aid. Then, two or three days later, suddenly he said it was a partisan issue, knowing of course that it was not a partisan issue. Hatfield at the time had cabled, and Javits and others had cabled from Washington supporting him. Anyhow, that is the heart of my suggestion: that there has to be some coordination in government or we are not going to get anywhere. And the people involved in the decision - making all have their own perspectives; as long as there is no policy coordination in government or we are not going to get anywhere. And the people involved in the decision making all have their own perspectives; as long as there is no policy coordination, it is apparent that we are not going to get a cohesive national policy on this subject. And Ford is having apparent difficulties sifting through the recommendations. Ash says, tight monetary policy; Simon says, balance of payments; Butz says, remember the USDA budget; and Kissinger says do it. Ford has to sift all that advice. In a time of recession, he has not even made up his mind which is the worse evil: recession or inflation. We have a need very soon for some ad hoc group working out of the White House as well as out of Congress.

Q. Did you take a public stand at Rome on increasing U.S. commitment for food aid, and does it do any good?

A. We cabled Ford. We were told that one man was the contact in the White House for food aid. Cables just came flooding in and we passed then on, and meetings were set up and all that sort of thing. We began to become a little suspicious of just how effectively we were working through this person. So, a friend got hold of a Protestant minister from Grand Rapids who was an old friend of the contact man, who was also from Grand Rapids. The minister came back saying: "I hate to tell you, but those cables are sitting on that desk and not necessarily going into the Oval Office, which means that Ford's intake is being screened. I do not know if he has seen any of the cables. Maybe after some sort of flood of cables to the White House, Ford might have to just bump into a cable." Father Hesburgh is a very decent man who commands wide public respect on a nonsectarian basis; his public statement picked up enormous news coverage immediately after the world food conference. Efforts like that, it seems to me, are worthwhile in that they do convey concern. The fact is that the administration is considering some increase in the amount of food aid; the amount is where our quibbling and our leverage come into play. But for the short term, most of us ought to begin to put our efforts on fiscal year 1976 food aid, because 1975 is just too late. I also think that every church spokesperson who addresses himself or herself to this issue has to make it very clear that we do not want food aid used for political purposes alone. I know that many people in the Agency for International Development are sympathetic with this point of view but their hands are tied because of pressure from the State Department. I think that the louder and clearer and more often we make this idea heard publicly, the greater the pressure we will begin to bring on the administration and on the Congress. I am not sure that the fact that we have a more liberal and democratic Congress means that we have natural allies on this issue. Many of them specifically got elected on a platform of cutting two major big-spending programs: foreign assistance and defense. And I will argue that the former is a crucial point. But what kind of foreign assistance will they cut: airplanes or food for the hungry? The churches have been until now pretty slow in getting involved in the political arena on this subject, and many relief agencies need to move also. They have to spend some time educating the American public or we are going to lose what constituency we do have on these issues. This is where the hard work is; those who have resources have got to use them now. Otherwise, we are going to lose any momentum we may have accumulated so far. The foreign aid bill was passed by one vote.

Q. Do I understand that you are opposed to giving up meat?

A. First of all, I would not want to go on record as saying I believe giving up meat is ineffective or wrong. I do not hold that view; I simply raised the question of efficacy for those who are contemplating its public advocacy. After all of the great social programs of the 1960's, the question arises in the 1970's, were those programs effective, or were they in fact counterproductive? Some research out of MIT seems to indicate that in some of the initial moves on housing, the analysis was faulty. When we have faulty analysis, logic seems to lead us to conclude that by and large we are going to have faulty resolution of the problem, because we have not understood the nature of the problem. The analysis in the early 60's on the housing question was that there was a housing shortage in the inner city. The resolution seemed pretty simple: tear down some of that slum housing and put up new, adequate housing. Actually what happened was that more people than ever flocked to the inner city, and fewer of them could afford that new housing. The result was an ongoing syndrome of housing shortages that theoretically might never be resolved. It is that sort of danger I worry about; I worry about the false expectations potentially inherent in the call for giving up beef. But that is not to deny its value symbolically. It is to be realized that nobody has yet demonstrated that this measure is going to be efficacious.

Q. The question I have is not just advocating giving up meat, but we are advocating that any money that they would save on a meal will be sent to a place where others could use it to provide food and services; that is what I know our own congregation and others are advocating.

A. That is right; there you are getting into that efficacious dimension. And there you have the question of administrative practices, of what percentage is used for overhead and that sort of thing. Freedom from hunger accepts a large number of contributions and an awful lot of Roman Catholic Sisters have done precisely what your congregation did. They wrote: "Here is a check for food we gave up, for fasting for such and such a period of time, or cut down on our consumption. Here is our estimation of what we normally would have spent on that, and use it for a good cause." But I also wish that people would take it under advisement that everyone wants to see a cow go to a hungry family or something like that, but not everyone wants to spend money to help defray the costs to move that money, to move that product, to raise public education in the United States, to produce literature. This is legitimate expenditure but people seem to have some sort of dirty or bad connotation about that. It is disappointing to me because in this particular economic period, where in God's name are people going to get money for the educational aspect of this problem?

Gerald E. Connolly
Executive Director
American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, Inc.
1625 Eye Street, NW   Suite 719
Washington, DC   20006

TEACHING ABOUT GLOBAL INTERDEPENDENCE AND DEVELOPMENT

Jayne Millar Wood

We live in an interdependent world. A world characterized by a growing gap between rich and poor. Today as we participate in this meeting 330,000 new babies will be born and 134,000 people will die. At this rate, the world each day gains an additional 196,000 mouths to feed, bodies to clothe, minds to educate. Of these, over 85 percent live in rural areas in the developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Only 40 percent will have the opportunity to achieve literacy as compared to 97 percent in the developed countries. Over 12 percent of the children will die in infancy because they have limited access to medical care and more than two-thirds of these people will suffer from hunger and nutrition-related diseases, because there is not enough food, and what food there is is not equitably distributed. But these details are not the substance of headlines. Though dramatic, only occasionally do such stories, as in the case of the Sahelian drought or famine in India, make the news for any period of time before they, too, are ignored or forgotten.

Let us look at the developing world as a whole which is characterized by conditions of extreme poverty. Most of the people live on an average income of less than $300 per year, compared to an average per capita income in the rich countries of $3,500. Moreover, the distribution of income and wealth within developing countries is skewed. For example, in India 12 percent of the rural families control more than half of the cultivated land. In Brazil, less than 10 percent of the families control 75 percent of the land.

In the poorer countries population growth is rampant. Though the average population growth rate is approximately 2 percent per year, many of the developing countries have a growth rate over 3 percent or more per year, which means that populations double every 20 - 23 years. In contrast, the United States population growth rate is doubling only 1.0 percent every 70 years. This rapid population growth only exacerbates existing problems, straining already over-burdened social institutions. Educational institutions, for example, have not been able to keep up with the rising demands. As a result, there are over 100 million more adult illiterates today than there were twenty years ago. As more and more people rush to the cities seeking work, unemployment in many areas runs from 15 to 25 percent and is rising. Adequate health care is practically non-existent.

But poverty and underdevelopment is not found only in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In our own country the gap between rich and poor is widening. Though numbers are difficult to obtain because many people are ineligible for benefits and many never report, statistics for 1973 show that approximately 11.1 percent of the whole U.S. population was classified as poor. This was about 23 million people. The elderly, American Indians, children and Blacks account for the largest percentages of the poor population, yet they represent only a small percentage of the total population. A recent study indicated that the richest 5 percent of the U.S. population receive nearly 15.5 percent of the total U.S. income.

The food issue has heightened our awareness of the growing gap between rich and poor and the interdependence of nations. Grain consumption in the developing countries, for example, is on the average about one-fifth that of people living in developed countries. Whereas only 400 pounds of grain per year are available for consumption to individuals in the developing countries (all consumed directly), the average North American consumes nearly one ton (2,000 pounds) of grain per year, with less than 200 pounds of that consumed directly. The rest is consumed indirectly through meat, milk and eggs. Therefore, we are talking about five times as many agricultural resources being required to feed the average American as the average Indian, Nigerian or Colombian. This can be illustrated another way in terms of land use: about three and one-half acres of land are needed to produce a meat-centered diet for one person. Whereas only one-fifth of an acre is required to produce a diet based on plant protein for one person. Knowing these facts and given the growing scarcity of certain resources in the world, can we as rich Americans continue to eat as much in the future as we have in the past?

Today we face an unprecedented problem of food scarcity. Though there has probably not been a single year in recorded history where food shortages and famine have not occurred somewhere in the world, this year (1974) the specter of world hunger has burst into our consciousness in new ways. C.P. Snow made a prophetic comment several years ago on the situation of mass starvation when he said ,"We will watch it on television ..." and we have. For the last year there have been dozens of television programs relating to the food issue and the problems of distributing food to the hungry. Hence, it is important to understand why people are starving. It was not just the Russian wheat deal which depleted our supplies. Rather, today's food scarcity situation is the result of a combination of events over the last twenty years.

Let us look at some of these longer-term trends to see how they have contributed to the situation of scarcity. Continued increases in the world's population have increased demand for the world's food supplies at the global level. If world population continues to expand at its present rate of 2 percent per year, doubling every 35 years, then just to maintain current consumption levels will require a doubling of food production. But population growth is not the only "culprit." Rising affluence around the world has had a serious impact on food consumption patterns as well and has now come to demand a disproportionate share of the food which is produced. Throughout the world, per capita grain consumption rises with income. As mentioned earlier, this can best be understood by examining the effect of rising affluence on grain requirement. The average North American consumes nearly one ton (2,000 pounds) of grain per year compared to the average person in the developing countries who consumes roughly 400 to 500 pounds of grain per year.

Though growing population and rising affluence have become the two major claimants on the world's supply of food, other longer-term factors related to the production of food contribute to today's scarce food situation. First of all, scientists have been unable to achieve technological breakthroughs in critical areas of food production, namely with cows and soybeans. Second, the ecological undermining of major food-producing systems has reduced or severely limited food production. For example, the productive capacity of certain large agricultural areas has diminished due to unwise land management policies as in the Sahel where overgrazing and deforestation have led to the southward advancement of the desert at rates of thirty miles per year along a 3,500 mile fringe. Third, the world fish catch has declined due to overfishing and perhaps pollution. Fourth, though major increases in production have taken place in the rich countries, agricultural development in the poorer countries has proceeded relatively slowly. And fifth, the critical resources necessary for the increases in food production - fertilizer, land, water, and energy - have become increasingly scarce. Taken collectively, these trends have inhibited the expansion of food production for many developing countries.

In addition to the longer-term trends described above, several specific events in 1972-73 precipitated the present crisis. In 1972, crops failed and were inadequate in several major areas - in Russia, in China, in India, and in the Sahel. In addition, Russia bought almost 30 million tons of U.S. grain in secrecy and at an unreasonably low price. (This amount coincidentally was equal to the increment of grain which the world needs each year to cope with the yearly increment in population. These difficulties were compounded when, in 1973, U.S. government officials, not fully in touch with the pending food consumption/production crisis, failed to expand acreage as they might have. And, in the same year, the OPEC countries tripled the price of oil per barrel putting power and fertilizers out of the reach of the poor farmers everywhere. Finally, an adequate but not a record crop in 1973, though it did not make the situation worse, failed to reconstitute the world's grain reserves.

Hence we found ourselves in 1975 with widespread hunger in many parts of the world. It is possible that this year's crop, particularly in developed countries, will exceed our expectations and the world will again, for the moment, be in a situation of food surplus. However, we must not forget that this situation is only temporary. The vagaries of weather, population growth, and the increased demand for food due to rising affluence will deplete our food reserves, and we will again face another situation of food scarcity.

What do all these global trends mean for us as educators and for the educational system? How are the specific problems of food supply and population growth related to the more general, longer-term issues of global development and interdependence? What should our response as educators be to the changing world situation? How do we prepare students to live in a global community? Secretary of State Kissinger has stated that "a world community cannot remain divided between the permanently rich and the permanently poor." Sooner or later the collision between those who "have" and those who "have not" is inevitable. Unless we start to work on some basic changes in our educational systems in order to prepare to live in a global community, there will be little chance to realize the goals of justice and peace in the world.

The world is fast becoming a single unit for humankind. This is happening whether we like it or not. Resource scarcities, international trade, an increasingly complex monetary system, shared food supplies, and ecological crises are but a few of the ties among people and nations around the world. As the number of such ties increases, one begins to appreciate how rapidly our daily well-being is becoming irrevocably dependent on the resources and cooperation of other nations.

Edwin W. Reishauer in his book, Toward the 21st Century: Education for a Changing World, has stressed the need for a profound reshaping of education if mankind is to survive in this world which is fast evolving. Today's global problems can potentially be solved through international cooperation, but only if such cooperative efforts are supported everywhere by an informed citizenry that is educated in a new and radically different way. He suggests that we need to educate ourselves for a changing world - a world that will be confronted by dilemmas and decisions that we are only now beginning to recognize. If humankind is becoming a single unit, a family of nations, then a new perspective for global living is needed - a perspective that includes knowledge about and acceptance of individual peoples and cultures at the same time that it recognizes the intricate interrelationships among peoples and the need to contribute to the welfare of all.

A survey conducted in late 1972 revealed that the youth of America are concerned about these issues. This survey of attitudes of young people between the ages of 18 and 25 revealed that more young Americans assigned "top priority" to the solution of world hunger and poverty than the solution of any other world problem. But the survey also revealed the misconceptions that young people have about the extent of poverty and their lack of information about the poor. Particularly important for educators is that the survey showed that individuals who are informed on issues such as hunger and poverty are more sympathetic to the problems. The survey responses additionally demonstrated that American attitudes on such issues are more directly a function of education than of any other single variable. For these reasons - the increasing speed by which our daily lives are affected by the implications of an interdependent world, the already high level of interest among students of these issues, an evident relationship between education and the development of sympathy for the problems of hunger and poverty - the time is surely right for introducing such topics into the classrooms.

We need to help students understand the meaning of such complex concepts as "global interdependence," and "development." We need to raise questions of values and ethics in international affairs, especially regarding the role of the United States as a rich nation in a world where there are many poor. We also need to examine our priorities for action on a both personal and national level. For example, last year American consumers spent roughly 13.5 billion on tobacco products compared to 21.5 million given to

CARE and 8 million given to UNICEF. During fiscal year 1974 the U.S. government gave South Vietnam and Cambodia $499.7 million in food aid via PL 480. These countries have a combined population of 27 million, with much dislocation due to the war, but few on the brink of starvation. In Africa's sub-Sahelian region, with a combined population of 50 million, hundreds of thousands have already died of starvation. Yet the United States sent only $56.3 million to those nations via PL 480.

Though many would find such issues as food, population, and personal priorities too controversial for the classroom, we need to deal with them and help students to work with such questions. After all, today's students will become the policymakers of the 21st century. They had better begin to think about such issues now.

How can we add a global outlook to our curriculum? Few existing courses include a global perspective that stresses the realities of an interdependent world. Rather our schools tend to inculcate in pupils a general outlook in which this country forms the hub of the world. This outlook leads to an interpretation of events and situations in other parts of the world that centers primarily on how those parts of the world influence the position of our own country. Rarely do we ponder how the actions of Americans affect other countries. This narrow outlook tends to overvalue our culture and interests as it simultaneously undervalues the cultures and interests of other peoples. It is also one of the basic obstacles to world peace.

Overcoming this narrow interpretation of events requires a major change in the basic reference system commonly found in American schools. No longer is a historical chronology of world events or a detailed description or analysis of a number of strange and different cultures sufficient. Instead we must adopt a global perspective in which this country forms but a part of the whole and in which U.S. problems and interests are carefully weighed against the problems and interests of other countries.

The concept of interdependence - which refers to social, political and economic interrelations as well as to resource, ecological and technical interdependence should pervade most, if not all, courses. Understanding of this theme at both effective and cognitive levels is critical to the development of global consciousness. We need to develop behavioral objectives that are appropriate to a particular course, for example history or economics. These need to be stated in terms that recognize and amplify the interrelatedness of institutions and activities around the world. Teachers might spend a week at the beginning of a new course, or at the beginning of a semester, working with the concept of interdependence. This will bring rewards later as students come to appreciate why they are studying a certain country or situation and how this relates to their lives.

The theme of global interdependence and development can be interwoven into existing courses in many ways. For example, in U.S. History, Government or American Studies classes one might pursue the theme of problems, priorities, and responsibilities of the United States in an interdependent world.

We could, for example, look forward to celebrating our 200th anniversary of interdependence rather than independence. We could compare development problems at home with those that we see in other countries. We might also raise questions about the role the United States, the largest supplier of food in the world, should play in supplying food to a hungry world. World History and World Studies courses also offer an opportunity to examine many of the interrelationships between rich and poor countries. For example, one could explore the origins of the gap between rich and poor and the effects of European colonization. Or, discuss how the system of international trade which exists today has grown out of past exploitative relationships between the colonizers and the colonized. Or, what will things be like in the year 2000? What can historical trends tell us? How do todays' trends give us some understanding process of the future? In a Sociology or Current Problems class why not examine the "problems" in a global context - inflation, poverty, resource scarcity, crowded cities, and ecological imbalances are not confined to the United States. One could also do a comparative study of the various dimensions of poverty - health, racism, education, housing, unemployment, population growth, food scarcity - around the world. Courses in Economics must also increasingly focus on our interrelationships with other nations. International power relationships among nations are changing as security concerns give way to greater economic issues. These changes will require that the United States and other rich industrialized countries pay greater attention to the needs and desires of the people who live in the poorer developing countries. A discussion of the developing countries can be integrated into an economics curricula at many points: the problems of inflation, international trade, the monetary system, expansion, of multinational corporations, foreign assistance, and global resources scarcities all demand that students become sensitive to the intricate patterns and relationships between richer and poorer countries.

In looking at our current social studies curricula framework, there is a place in almost all courses, including Anthropology, Comparative Cultures, Geography, Area Studies, for a more global perspective. It is up to us as educators to develop a global awareness both in ourselves and in our students. This is the challenge we face. To be responsive educators we need to go beyond the dramas of the present, beyond the confines of our borders and look at the way the world is changing so that our students, who will be 35, 45 or 50 years old in the year 2000, will be prepared to make the right choices for a peaceful and prosperous future.

Mrs. Jayne Millar Wood
Director of Public Education
Overseas Development Council
1717 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

WHAT EACH OF US CAN DO

Judith R. Seltzer

Whether we are conscious of it or not, whether we intend it or not, each of us is a population actor. Each of us participates in population processes. Throughout the life cycle we all experience certain demographic events such as birth, death, a move, marriage, and all these events affect family life, the community and society as a whole. Sometimes we have control over these events and processes; other times not. Sometimes we are aware of our influence; too often we are not.

Population education can promote "population literacy" and can awaken an understanding of the causes and consequences of population change. Three learning objectives for population education are frequently employed:

1) to help students understand how their own actions can change the size and character of the population of which they are members;

2) to help students understand how population changes affect the individual and society in the United States and the world; and

3) to help students develop knowledge and skills necessary to evaluate the impact of both personal and public decisions affecting population.

The content of population education courses in terms of the selection of topics, issues, materials, etc. will of course depend upon what each educator perceives as important population issues. One educator will emphasize pollution, erosion of recreational space, environmental damage; and another will focus on the danger of long-range eco-catastrophe. Educators centering discussion on either of these natural problems are likely to be biology teachers. In contrast, teachers focusing on problems intensified by the impact of population on urban congestion and on social conditions are more likely to be social studies teachers. The best of all learning worlds, of course, would be one in which the biology teachers and the social studies teachers presented a full and diverse coverage of population issues by working in a team teaching situation.

In addition to an educator's own discipline background, the perception of important population issues will vary with time and place. Approximately one half of the counties in the U.S. actually declined in population during the last three decades. The student living in one of these counties will certainly perceive the impact of population change differently from a child living in a city's central core or in the suburban fringe. To be meaningful to individual students, therefore, educators should attempt to focus on the demographic circumstances of their own state and community when providing evidence of the variety of ways population change affects individuals.

Most activity in the field of population education is carried on by individual teachers working within a local school system. For example, at the Population Reference Bureau, we receive hundreds of requests in a year's time for population information and for suggestions of useful materials from teachers interested in developing their own units and in infusing population elements into existing course units. Beside these isolated efforts, a number of university based programs have been developed over the past few years. These university efforts such as those at the University of North Carolina, Florida State University, and the University of Cincinnati have concentrated on teacher training and curriculum development.

Three boarder programs in population education at the secondary school level merit special attention. First is a city-wide program established about three and one-half years ago in Baltimore, MD. A small group of teachers and interested residents formed the Urban Life Population Education Institute to work with the school system. The focus of this institute was initially to examine urban problems and then to see how population change affects urban life. The Institute's work has developed in several phases:

- conducted workshops for Baltimore city teachers to discuss population in the urban context and to give teachers basic demographic skills;
- conducted series of 3-week summer institutes in which teachers developed their own materials;
- publication of curriculum materials for use in city schools.

> Four units, including student and teacher editions, include the following: "Demography and You" (basic demographic concepts); "Individual and Family Life Styles" (alternative lifestyles such as nonmarriage, marriage without children; marriage with small family and marriage with large family); "Baltimore" (character of Baltimore city population); "Demography and Environment Earth" (impact of growth, concept of carrying capacity, optimum population).

A second population education program is being implemented in Pennsylvania as part of the state environmental education curriculum. Here the focus is to study the impact of population growth on world resources and other environmental consequences of population change. A curriculum package was developed at the state level and includes five units: "Population Dynamics and the World"; "Population Dynamics and Nature"; "Population Dynamics and Society"; "Population Dynamics and the Economy"; and "Population Dynamics and the Individual."

A third effort was carried out by the Department of Education in Washington State. Again at the state level a unit was prepared, "Teaching Population Concepts", which covers the history of world population growth, U.S. population growth, and Washington State. The unit also presents basic concepts and activities. No specific implementation was planned although the units have been widely disseminated to educators throughout the state.

Many population education materials are available and can be adapted for use in various disciplines and at various grade levels. Each teacher must choose what materials are most appropriate to his or her classroom setting. The NCEA pamphlet on "Population Education - A Catholic Response" includes an excellent list of materials. In addition, the packet of materials (distributed during the session to all participants) includes a population education resource list. This list divides the materials by teacher resources, teacher/student and student. Games and films are also recommended in the list.

Other materials are:

Options: A Study Guide to Population and the American Future. This includes the conceptual framework of "Each of Us: A Population Actor"; learning objectives keyed to specific classroom activities relating population to questions about the environment, the economy, population distribution, age structure; etc.

Interchange: a national population education newsletter for high school and college teachers which serves as a communications link for educators interested in teaching population. The newsletter provides activity and resource suggestions.

Miss Judy Seltzer
Staff Associate
Population Reference Bureau
1754 N St., NW
Washington, DC 20036

POPULATION EDUCATION
as
PART OF EDUCATION FOR JUSTICE

Rev. Peter J. Henriot, SJ

About a little over two years ago, the Center of Concern decided to pick the question of population policy as an important global issue to focus on. We did this for a variety of reasons: 1) Population was on the world's agenda as a critical topic, with 1974 being designated "World Population Year"; 2) a United Nations Conference on the topic would be held in Bucharest in August of 1974, where population policy would be formulated; and 3) this population policy had serious value consequences - consequences for the kind of world we would be living in for the next several decades.

Our Center did a variety of things in our Population Policy Project, some of which you may possibly have read or heard about. One of the very creative things, I think, in terms of a small effort that has had significant impact because of the efforts of Sister Kathleen Short, Task Force Coordinator, was that the Center helped coordinate the beginning of a Task Force on Population Education with the NCEA. The Center also assisted in the coordination of a special issue of Theological Studies in March of 1974, that was entirely devoted to the question of population. If this issue hasn't been referred to already, I certainly want to call it to your attention as a source of information and insight regarding population. The Center held a series of seminars here in Washington, New York and Montreal, that brought together key United Nations, State Department, congressional, church, and non-governmental people to focus on questions of population policy. How is it being made? What are the values implied in it? And what direction is it taking?

Four of us from the Center went to Bucharest. We had non-governmental consultative status with the United Nations and participated actively in the World Population Conference and the Tribune. (The Tribune is defined as the gathering of non-governmental people.)

I give you that kind of background because what I would like to share with you is a very strong feeling, a very strong conviction, on the part of the Center of Concern, that the question of population is one of those issues where the kind of policy decisions that are being made will affect the future of the globe. And not just the future of "those people over there," in Latin America, in Asia and in Africa; or not just the future of all of us - because it affects the future of the kind of globe that we will be living in.

About three years ago, when the Catholic bishops met in the Roman Synod of 1971, they issued a statement on justice in the world. The bishops moved to the center, to a pivotal position, the whole question of education to justice. They said in effect that it was impossible to be about the task of Christian education without being about the task of education to justice. Because the task of justice - as I am sure you have heard quoted many times, of action for justice, is "constitutive to the preaching of the Gospel." Any kind of education that would educate to Gospel values must of necessity educate to justice. And then in 1972, the bishops in the United States issued a Pastoral on Catholic Education, "To Teach as Jesus Did." They emphasized in that Pastoral that education to justice was central to the task of Christian education.

I'd like to suggest in a general way what I think education to justice is. And then, in a specific way, what I think population education much as you have heard it talked about in the last 24 hours - is in relation to education to justice.

Education to justice, in my opinion, has three components. It has a variety of components, of course, but being a good Jesuit, educated in a sort of a "trinitarian viewpoint," I'll say that it has three major components.

I think that the first component is that it directs our attention to the structures of society. Justice is basically a structural issue. It involves the institutions, the processes, of how society operates and interacts. Education to justice, therefore, does something that Gustavo Gutierrez, the Latin American theologian of liberation has spoken of. He describes the need to move from the anecdotal to the analytical. Education to justice moves us from a story about a case of justice or injustice, or an instance of a particular social problem, or an ad hoc or pragmatic approach to some solution - a sort of anecdotal approach - to an analysis of how things are tied together. How this particular problem relates to that problem. And how this solution has consequences for that solution. We begin to see the structural relationships. Education to justice focuses on the structures of society, the structures of global society. For example, when a problem such as the food crisis is talked about, it cannot effectively be talked about outside of the basic structural relationships of trade, monetary patterns, investment patterns, between the rich nations and the poor nations. It is meaningless to talk about food simply as a question, for instance, of more production in some particular rural area. It must be talked about in terms of global structures. Education to justice is foremost an analysis of the structures of society.

Secondly, education to justice has as a component an explicit attention to values. There is a great deal of discussion these days about value-clarification in the task of education. Well, value-clarification is a great help for education to justice, because the structures of society are not neutral. They embody values since they are the products of human interaction. The structures, the processes, the institutions of society are products of personal and interpersonal actions and hence embody the values which characterize those personal and inter-personal actions. Education to justice taken seriously in a structural sense must take seriously the task of explicitating what kind of values are embodied in particular structures. What are the assumptions, the value assumptions, that underlie particular decisions? In a sense, education to justice rejects outright any "value free" science. There simply is no "value free" science. We may try to get objective answers to certain questions we ask. But the kinds of questions we ask reveal the sorts of values we have. Education to justice is explicitly an attention to values, and an effort to see how these values affect the decisions in our society that relate to social structures.

And lastly, it seems to me that education to justice contains as a component a strong emphasis upon our mindsets, or perspectives. Bill Ryan, the Director of the Center of Concern, likes to use the phrase "mindset" again and again. Many of you who have read some of his writings or heard him speak know that this is a very common expression with him. I think that what he is trying to emphasize, and what I want to emphasize in using the term, is that basic and primary to any task of education is the effort to help people understand how they view reality. And how they view reality is culturally conditioned, is socialized by patterns of experience, is influenced by certain modes of upbringing. Attending to our mindsets, making explicit again and again what our perspectives are, is a key part of educating to justice. To see what sort of values are implicit in the perspectives that we bring to bear on reality tells us a lot about the kinds of questions we ask. It tells us a lot about the kinds of answers that we would try to seek and would be willing to accept. So the task of education to justice is very much an effort to help us to understand how we see things. Do we realize that the way we see things is not the only way to see things? And do we appreciate that looking at reality in another way might give a considerably different set of questions and answers?

Now that is a short abstract discourse on "education to justice." It takes seriously the structural. It explicitates values. And it concentrates on our mindsets and perspectives.

What does all this say about education that relates to the question of population? How is population education related to education to justice? First of all, I think that population education, if it be related to education to justice, must of necessity take seriously the structural questions that make up the problem of population today. The population problem is a matter of the world's population presently doubling every 35 years. Population growth has to stabilize at some point. Traditionally it has stabilized through war and famine, and it may very well stabilize in that way in our own near future. But that's hardly a human kind of solution. What should be done? A simple focus on an anecdotal approach, an ad hoc pragmatic approach, would for example emphasize that population stabilization comes about by the provision of family planning services. Simply providing more clinical services - education to help people make choices and provision of the means (natural or artificial) to plan a family - can be an anecdotal, ad hoc approach. But to see the issue in a more analytical or structural way, we must come to understand the relationship between population and development, between population and the structures of development, between population and consumption.

I'm sure you have already heard today what occurred in Bucharest at the World Population Conference. I view what happened there in terms of a major shift from a more ad hoc, pragmatic demographic focus to a more structural developmental focus. What was heard again and again from the developing countries was a very simple question: Is the key problem too many people or too much poverty? Many of the developing countries emphasized that it is the latter. And so we need to attack that problem of poverty. This of course includes dealing with the issue of population, but it puts this issue into a context, into a structural context. It recognizes the fact that historically there has never been a stabilization of population in any society that is poor and illiterate, but there has never failed to be stabilization of population in societies that have moved out of poverty and illiteracy. Not into levels of great affluence, but simply into levels of subsistence where people can truly plan for the future. This will include planning their family - because they have a hope in that future, a hope that is grounded in socio-economic development. And so population education must, of necessity, take into account the structures of development.

Because population is related to development, again and again in Bucharest we heard the phrase "the New International Economic Order." This was the declaration passed by the Sixth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly in April, in New York. It was a call for recognition that true development requires a basic restructuring of the "rules of the game" between rich and poor nations relating to trade, investment patterns, monetary relationships and power structures. Unfortunately, however, the United States repeatedly objected to the mention of the "New International Economic Order." The United States delegation said that this topic had no place in a discussion of population. And yet those who raised the issue said it had every place in a discussion of population, if population is seen in its structural sense - in terms of the relationship between development and population stabilization. Therefore, I think that population education which is related to education to justice will point clearly to the developmental relationships.

Population education in a structural sense must also point to the relationships to consumption. I am sure that you have heard references to this topic here before. Many in Bucharest among the developing countries said, "You rich nations ask us to undergo significant changes in our mores and customs and ways of doing things, by stabilizing our population. Are you likewise willing to undergo significant changes in your mores and customs, by stabilizing the rates of your consumption, the rates of your exhaustion of resources?" The answer from the rich nations, led by the United States, was: "That has nothing to do with the issue. Consumption is not a population question." But structurally, consumption of resources is significantly tied to the population issue.

Secondly, population and values. How are decisions made? What are the bases on which decisions are made? Let's take a very current example. Since the Bucharest conference, the United Nations World Food Conference was held in Rome in November. On the next Wednesday morning, on

Capitol Hill, Senators McGovern, Humphrey, Clark and several others who participated in the Rome Food Conference are going to be holding a special hearing to bring a focus on the food question. The focus will be on the need for immediate humanitarian assistance to tide over some nations where many millions of people may not make it through the next few months.

There is a rising concern - and you probably have seen it in advertisements in the newspapers, I'm sure, or in letters to the editor - that food aid should not be given to those countries which are not working to stabilize their population, which do not have effective population programs now in operation. Now I would suggest that there are some values that are implicit in these projects. One set of values can be found in the so-called "triage theory." This theory - actually it's an analogy taken from the practice of military medicine - says that if there has been a battle and a number of wounded soldiers are brought into a small hospital camp where there are not sufficient drugs or sufficient doctors and nurses, a division must be made. For example, the first group is screaming in great pain, but will make it even if immediate help is not given. The second group is yelling for drugs and nurses and assistance and will make it only if given immediate attention. The third group is in great agony and great pain, but no matter how much is done for them, they are not going to make it. So the doctors have to make a choice. They will forget about the first group who will pull through even without immediate help. They will concentrate on the second group because only if they receive help will they survive. They will forget about the third group because no matter how great the need and no matter how great the attention, they simply will not make it.

Now it is suggested that this division has to be made with the nations of the world. There are some nations that will make it on their own even though they are in bad shape. Some nations, if we give them help right now, will be able to pull through. And some nations, no matter how much we might like to help them, aren't going to survive. We are just wasting our assistance on them. Their population growth rate is too high and they can't possibly produce enough food. So write them off! Nations like India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia - a billion people! This kind of hard-headed, "ethical" decision is being offered again and again in public discussions as a necessary solution.

There is also a new, more interesting analogy that is used, called the "lifeboat ethic." Some of you might have seen the article in *Psychology Today* (October 1974) by Garrett Hardin. In brief, he argues: "Face the facts. We rich nations are on a lifeboat. There are supplies only for fifty people and there are forty of us on the lifeboat with hundreds - the poor nations - swimming around. And, you know they all want to get on our lifeboat and be saved. But if they all get on, we will all go under. The ethical thing, therefore, is to push them off." This is what we in the rich nations have to learn to accept. It may be hard to do, but we've got to stop giving all this humanitarian food aid. That simply helps the poor to live a little longer and have a few more children and make the problem that much greater!

Well you will note, I am sure, that there are some very real values in the triage and lifeboat positions. There are certain assumptions made by those who argue those positions. One assumption is that the rich nations will make no change in their own levels of affluence and consumption. We will maintain the status quo. This is a basic given, and we will deal with other nations from this standpoint. Secondly, the assumption is made not to address at all the structural questions of relationships between rich nations and poor nations - the economic order questions. And thirdly, the fact is ignored that development - which is more than simply relief aid of food but is genuinely helping nations to develop - has an immediate impact upon population. This point was made earlier, that nations which are allowed better development possibilities of family planning, would be nations which stabilize their population growth rates. The values that are implicit in a good deal of what is offered now as solutions to the population-food issue need to be explicitated, need to be named, need to be clarified. And I think that this is part of the task of population education. When a proposal comes forth, we need to ask very seriously: What are the values? Whose are the values? The values of the world? Whose world? Frequently in Bucharest we heard, "It is in the interest of the world that certain things be done this way." I guess one of the questions I would have is, whose world? The world of the majority of people, or the world of the minority of people - those who have much and want to keep it?

The third way that population education relates to education to justice is in the whole area of perspectives. I am sure that what you have already heard today helps in the broadening of your perspectives, perhaps the shattering of certain mindsets, and the building up of new mindsets. I would suggest that one way to do something in the next few weeks simply to test your own perspectives and mindsets as they relate to population as well as to several other things, is to read the daily newspaper with special care. As certain events are reported, ask yourself with what perspective you read about them. Basically, almost all of us read with the perspectives of North Americans, educated, certain backgrounds, particular jobs. But might we not see things in a differenc perspective if we were a peasant in Asia, if we were a struggling government planner in Africa, if we were an urban slum dweller in Latin America? Might not this different perspective tell us something about the kinds of decisions that are made, the way the questions are asked, the ways the answers are sought?

Let me give you an example of this question of perspective. Several years ago Paul Erlich wrote a book called The Population Bomb. The title of the book reveals a particular perspective, a particular mindset. Population is people. To talk about a "population bomb", a "population explosion," doesn't address quite so nicely the issue of human beings! But the book is challenging and it raises a lot of very good questions. In one interesting paragraph, Erlich tells us how the population problem first hit him as a very serious issue. He said that it occurred to him "one stinking hot night" in New Delhi:

> As we crawled through the city (in a taxi), we entered a crowded slum area. The temperature was well over 100, and the air was a haze of dust and smoke. The streets

> seemed alive with people. People eating, people washing, people sleeping. People visiting, arguing and screaming. People thrusting their hands through the taxi window, begging. People defecating and urinating. People clinging to buses. People herding animals. People, people, people, people. As we moved slowly through the mob, hand-horn squawking, the dust, noise, heat and cooking fires gave the scene a hellish aspect. Would we ever get to our hotel? All three of us were, frankly, frightened... Since that night I've known the feel of overpopulation.

An African friend of mine describes a similar scene, when he visited Los Angeles, in Paul Erlich's home state.

> We attempted to cross the street on foot. The temperature was well over 100 and the air was a haze of fumes and smoke. The streets were alive with cars - cars gobbling gasoline from long pipes attached to gasoline wells, cars being sprayed with drinking water which would have sufficed for our families for one whole month, cars sleeping in the streets. Cars honking, yelling, screaming at each other. Cars twisting and forcing their way in front of other cars, cars forcing terrified pedestrians onto the narrow pavements, cars ramming into each other, cars running over pedestrians - we were almost killed twice. Cars defecating billows of toxic fumes which can't be used to fertilize the fields like our nightsoil, cars urinating dribbles of oil. Cars, cars, cars, cars. As we slowly inched through the metallophagic mob of moving monsters, the dust, noise, heat, poisonous fumes, angry, hard-faced, tired-looking drivers gave the scene a hellish aspect. Would we ever get to our hotel? All three of us were, frankly, frightened...Since that day I've known the feel of carexplosion.

It is a matter of perspective, of mindset! Population education must cause us to examine how we phrase our questions.

So, in a brief way, I have tried to show the relevance of population education to education to justice. We promote education to justice by taking seriously the structural question of population, the relationships involved between population, development and consumption; by taking seriously the perspective, the mindset, what we bring to bear on this topic. I firmly think that population education is very centrally a part of what we who are involved in a variety of ways with Christian education are called to focus on today. Population is going to be a major issue with us for many years. It is tied to many other major issues. Food is an obvious instance, and population education must relate to this. Population is also tied to the critical question of women and to the whole question of 1975 - the United Nations International Women's Year. Certainly this will be a time when the social justice dimension of the status and roles of women are talked about.

That has all kinds of connections with population education. Moreover, population education will of necessity need to take into account questions related to the "New International Economic Order," questions about relationships between rich and poor countries. Population education will be central to the discussion of the kinds of values that we want in the future global society. The right to survive is a right that all of us have to struggle for, not only those who want to survive at a basic minimal level in the developing countries but also those of us who have much and who want to survive in a world that is worth surviving in - in a world that is more just and more fair!

I think that we Roman Catholics have a particularly great challenge relating to this whole topic. Possibly you have already talked about this and possibly we need to talk about it more. The issue of population has been something that we Roman Catholics have tended to shy away from. I remember that in one of the seminars held by the Center of Concern, Sidney Callahan remarked that she had felt for years that the topic of population was something she didn't talk about as a Catholic. For one thing, the topic got you into all kinds of problems relating to church teaching. And secondly, most people who talked about it weren't very nice people - they were sort of "anti-children" people. And so it was easier if you didn't talk about it at all. She admitted that this was wrong, because population is a matter of people and we have to address it. It's a matter of Christian education.

Hopefully, the kind of education to justice that is population education will have policy consequences. The topic of abortion, for example, is a central population issue that has been talked about a considerable amount in terms of its policy implications. But the issue of hunger and of starving children is also a population issue. And we Roman Catholics who are seriously concerned about population education must be sure that our concern about abortion is matched by our concern about hunger. We must be sure that our concern about the family and its values is as strong as our concern about the family of humankind and the structural relationships between rich and poor. For the reasons that I have shared with you, then, I believe that population education will be for many years a central part of education to justice. This means, as we now know, that it must be a central part of any truly Christian education.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. How does your vision of global justice relate to the thoughts of Teilhard de Chardin?

A. As a Jesuit, I am certainly influenced by Teilhard de Chardin. I think that the kind of vision he talked about in terms of a cosmic inter-relatedness is very basic to the future of evolving humankind. The world of today is very small - we have seen that very dramatically in the pictures from the surface of the moon. It is also very finite - we have experienced that very dramatically in the recent energy crisis. And it is very interdependent - we have experienced that by the fact that rising oil prices meant that we had to wait in line a long time last winter for gas, and also meant that people in India had less food to eat because there was less fertilizer for the crops. A world that is small, a world that is finite, a world that is highly interdependent: we are beginning to experience the reality that Teilhard de Chardin and others have pointed to, a growing complexification and interrelationship of truly global proportions. That's the reason why I ended my remarks with a reference to the right to survival. It's the survival of all of us that we should be worried about. I don't know if Bryan Hehir concluded his talk last night with his favorite quotation from C.P. Snow, the English philosopher. Let me mention it here. Snow was asked if the most terrible thing in the world is that millions are going to starve, and he answered , "No. The most terrible thing in the world is that millions are going to starve and that millions are going to watch them starve on color TV." Because then not only those millions who starve will die, but also those of us who watch on TV will die! What kind of a globe, of a civilization, of a world is it where that sort of a thing is allowed to happen? That's why the survival question, in a world that is very small, very finite, very interrelated, is a survival question for all of us. As for the lifeboat ethic, that those of us who have a lot of this world's goods will want to keep them by shoving other people off - I really don't think that any of us would like to live on that kind of a lifeboat. What sort of a people would it be who would live on that kind of a lifeboat? That's the real question of human survival.

Q. More and more of us are getting into issues like this and that of world hunger. But we are causing people to have feelings of guilt and if we can't offer them any practical channel to work that out there will be a great frustration. I feel the same way today, for every time we turn around someone says "Do this" and then somebody else says, "No, don't do that because such-and-such disastrous things will happen." After a while you get to the point that you just feel like you're tied. You would like to do something, and yet the only alternative you seem to have is to watch people die and do nothing because you don't know what to do.

A. Well, as you begin to study, to understand, to analyze all the complexities, you do get to what I call the "paralysis of analysis." There is just so much, how can we go any further? And yet I don't really think it's that way! I think there are outs - and that's probably my Teilhardian influence. There are outs and that's what gives hope. And I think the "guilt trip" laid on people is a waste of time as well as an offense to good people. The only kind of guilt that is good is creative guilt and that means simply a moment in which I realize that, "Yes, I am called to responsibility." Now, how is this shared in terms of education? I think it's shared by being honest that the problems are indeed great, and that because they are very complex there are no simple solutions. Then people don't feel guilty because they can't come up with a simple one-step solution. There are no simple solutions. Secondly, it is shared by the recognition that what individuals do is only significant when they do it with other individuals. These are public, structural questions we are talking about and they need public, structural responses. That means individuals cooperating with individuals. We need to educate people to an awareness that we aren't going to be able to solve the world hunger problem, or the world population problem, simply by an act of my own personal simpler life-style, for example. But many people cooperating together can have a significance.

That brings me to a third point. We need an education that promotes a pragmatic political sense that we are talking about some structural changes. And that means that we have to translate all our good will and concern into political responses for structural change. I think that education to justice means political education. It helps people understand the fact that in the United States today changes will come about only when there are different people making our laws, when there are different officials elected to office, when there are different local city leaders and state legislators, when there is a different openness in the political process, etc. I personally feel that there is a moral imperative to relate to the political. Now that is spoken with the bias of a political scientist, but I wanted to share it with you.

Q. What do you think about the "life-style" question. Do we really have to cut back on personal consumption in the U.S.?

A. I suspect that you have probably heard several differing views on this topic. What difference does it really make, you ask, to eat two less hamburgers a week? Senator Humphrey says that that will free up enough grain to feed all of India. And yet it won't free up any grain to feed anybody unless there are some structural, political changes in the process! So, the way that I talk about the personal response to the food problem, which I really do think is part of population education and relating population to food - is to describe three steps. All three need to be present in any effective response. The first one is at the level of personal life-style. Do I seriously want to live in a more just world? Well, if I am really serious about this I should be aware of the fact that it is going to be a world where there is more sharing and consequently more sparing - especially on the part of that 6% of the world's population which consumes 35 to 40 % of the world's total resources, the United States. If there is to be a more just world, there will be simpler life-styles on the part of those who have much now. So if I am serious about global justice, I guess the question I must ask myself is: "Am I preparing myself to live in a more just world?" Or in talking with people who have children: "Am I preparing my children to live in a more just world?" You who are educating children, are you helping the children to be prepared to live in a more just world? I think that's the basic reason for simpler life-styles. Eating less meat or using less gas or whatever other suggestions that are made - these help prepare us for living in a different world.

But some real changes will begin to occur only if a second step is taken. That is the translation to the structural, to the political. The thing that is necessary here is attention to immediate humanitarian needs. So we curtail some beef-eating in this country - that won't have any effect at all unless the President and the Congress make some immediate allocations of grain to the starving nations.

Immediate humanitarian assistance is needed in the very next month

That is why Father Hesburgh and Cardinal Cooke and other prominent leaders in the Christian and Jewish communities called upon President Ford two weeks to do that which he refused to do at the World Food Conference - allocate emergency grain stocks immediately. In Rome Mr. Butz said that it is impossible for the United States to free up grain at the present time and then he flew off to Egypt and Syria and signed contracts for the sale of grain! We can do better than that! But we also must take care not to put the squeeze on the small farmer in this country. Agribusiness, not the small farmer, should be squeezed.

The third step relates to the long-range. Humanitarian assistance is short-range. It's like the Thanksgiving basket given the poor - necessary and helpful, but the people are also hungry on the following Thursday! So we need long-range action. In Bucharest and again in Rome, there were calls for basic structural changes in trade patterns, monetary patterns, investment patterns, control of resources by the developing countries, and a chance to have a say in the global political power process. These structural changes are part of the long-range response. They need to be lobbied for. There is no constituency for developing countries in this country. I think that part of Catholic education to justice should include an emphasis on this third step.

So when I talk about a personal response to these global justice issues, I emphasize three interrelated steps: personal life-style, political pressure for humanitarian help, and political pressure for basic structural changes.

Rev. Peter J. Henriot, SJ
Staff Associate,
Center of Concern
13th St. and Otis St., NE
Washington, DC 20017

POPULATION ISSUES IN CATHOLIC CURRICULA: A PLAN OF ACTION

Brother John D. Olsen, CFX

This workshop was designed to increase awareness of the problems confronting our society regarding population distribution and population education. Skill and sensitivity are needed to impart to the next generations the knowledge and skill which they need in promoting a just society.

There are staggering quantities of data and complex moral dilemmas which seem to defy solution. Needed are educators who are willing to analyze this data into some manageable curriculum format.

Population problems are best seen in context of other justice issues - development, food shortages and power struggles. People of faith and hope feel that they can find solutions to the tremendous human problems involved. They can have an impact.

What we are about is a direct response to the Bishops' Pastoral. We are trying to take seriously the goal of service proposed by the Pastoral, and to put it in the context of the Gospel message of Jesus "to be our brother's keeper." Also involved is the message of the Bishops regarding social justice presented in 1971[1] and the American Bishops' statement regarding the population year presented in 1973.[2] There are some models available. One is a short but insightful unit developed by Sister Paula Gonzalez, S.C. at Mount St. Joseph in Ohio. It illustrates a number of important elements for curriculum development: objectives, clarity in presentation of content, creativity in design and professional quality in production.

Several recommendations regarding Population issues in Catholic curricula can be made:

1. Population issues should be seen as a positive and legitimate part of the curriculum of Catholic schools. Population education based on Christian values is an essential element of Christian education and should be so affirmed by this group to their professional colleagues. We have defined it "as the process by which an individual explores: the nature of population characteristics and variables; the causes of population change and the implications of these phenomena for the individual, the family, and society and the world.

2. Of necessity, population education is multi-disciplinary

---

[1] 1971 Bishops' Synod in Rome. Justice in the World

[2] National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Statement on Population, Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1973

in approach: Task force enlargement: enlarging on this definition, the task force saw the population education process as a systematic learning experience which reflects on population characteristics such as distribution, age, sex, race and religion structures, and dependency ratios. The population variables seen as primarily influencing these characteristics were fertility, mortality and migration patterns. The social phenomena seen to be the major sources of population changes were similarly agreed to be urbanization, employment, education, women's status, medical advances, war, famine, disease, income distribution, technology, housing, transportation, crime, land and resource use, and life style patterns.

Therefore, the curriculum should not be limited to units for religious education or social studies, but integrated to science, history, literature, economics, etc. This will require time and ingenuity.

3. Curriculum planning regarding population and other justice issues requires a certain skill in the development of good curriculum planning. This means that objectives should be clearly and behaviorally, if you will, stated. Materials and activities ought to be sophisticated in content and standards in evaluation should be included. Generally, we are talking about criterion-reference students, because youngsters will be at a variety of starting points as an understanding of these issues. Also, to use Blum's taxonomy objectives will be in the effective and moral domain. It is difficult to effect outcomes of any specific students. The work of Eisner, in what he calls expressive objectives, may be useful to teachers here. Briefly stated, we can use Robert Mager's exhortation to teachers: "We want to rise to zero and be on a big campus. Here's three questions you will always hear: 'Where are we going? How do we get there? How do we know we've arrived?' "

The movement toward multi-disciplinary pressures to major social problems is both current and appropriate. The new World Population Society which numbers among its board of directors anthropoligists, educators political figures, and those such as Margaret Mead, Lester Brown, Ambassador Matthews, etc. is dedicated to such a multi-disciplinary approach.

1. Population issues are related to the other justice issues. In the larger international conferences held to date on social problems, i.e., Stockholm Conference on the Environment, the Bucharest Conference on Population and the Rome Conference on Food have illustrated the need to see the issue under discussion in relation to development, food and hunger, energy and environment. Where the issue was treated in isolation of these other aspects, the discussion frequently faltered, and a few points became polarized.

2. It is important to recognize and treat the emotional content of the issues, as well as the intellectual, political and social content. We are responding to human issues, and this requires good and continuing communication with all the interested parties. In particular, it requires concern for the reaction of pastors and parents, as well as the reactions of students. The perspective may be different. In school, the student may focus on the injustices of some regulation in the school as an excuse for avoiding the global issue of justice. Older people may be caught up in the history of certain issues, rather than the immediate implications of the issue.

3. Utilize as many of the resources currently available. These include: "Education for Justice: A Resource Manual," ed. by Thomas P. Fenton ($7.95 a copy) from Orbis Books, Maryknoll, New York, 10545; "Educating for Peace and Justice: A Manual for Teachers," from The Institute for the Study of Peace, 3801 West Pine, St. Louis, Missouri, 63103; The Christophers, 12 East 48th Street, New York, NY, 10017; Leadership Conference of Women Religious, "Education for Justice: One Model."

4. Continued in-service is needed at the local and diocesan level. For this, consultation with people in the field will be important. The NCEA currently has two consultants working on peace and justice. They are:

   Sister Helen Garvey, SNJM, World Without War Council, 1730 Grove Street, Berkeley, CA 94709; and Brother Edward van Merrienboer, OP, 5444 South Woodlawn Avenue, #3, Chicago, Illinois, 60615. Consultation provided includes issues of peace and justice and is generally based on a multi-disciplinary approach.

Certainly we don't have all the answers to population education. A Catholic response is one exercise in what the Bishops' Pastoral calls a "ministry of hope." It requires that we recognize and build upon statements of our pontiffs and American bishops in the area of social justice. There is a richness here which is frequently underestimated.

Brother John D. Olsen, CFX
Executive Secretary
Secondary Department, NCEA

NCEA POPULATION EDUCATION TASK FORCE

Rev. Laurence Murphy
U.S. Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20005

Mr. Michael Henry
Center of Concern
3700 13th St. NE
Washington, DC 20017

Sister Josephine Dunne
Campaign for Human Development
U.S. Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20005

Sister Thelma Wurzelbacher, CPPS
School of Natural Resources
University of Michigan
2317 Packard Ave.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Sister Marjorie Tuite, OP
400 East 33rd Street
Chicago, IL 60616

Dr. Leon Bouvier
Vice President
Population Reference Bureau
1754 N St. NW
Washington, DC 20036

Miss Judy Seltzer, Staff Associate
Population Reference Bureau
1754 N St. NW
Washington, DC 20036

Sister Mary Peter Traviss, OP
Director of Education
P.O. Box 3508
Mission San Jose, CA 95438

Sister Mary Richardine, BVM
Director, Graduate Division
Clarke College
Dubuque, IA 52001

Rev. James McHugh
Executive Secretary
Bishops' Committee for Population
& Pro-Life Activities
National Conference of Catholic Bishops
1312 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20005

Sister Marita McGrath, SSND
Trinity College
Washington, DC 20017

Ms. Jane Blewett
Center of Concern
3700 13th St. NE
Washington, DC 20017

NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Rev. C.A. Koob, O. Praem.	President, NCEA
Rev. John F. Meyers	Acting Pres., NCEA, & Executive Secretary of Chief Administrators of Catholic Education
Miss Janet Horan	College and University Department
Brother Peter Clifford, FSC	Executive Secretary, Dept. of Secondary Education
Sister Kathleen Short, OP	Executive Secretary, Dept. of Elementary Education
Rev. Emmet Harrington	Executive Secretary, Dept. of Continuing Education

"... We believe that the Church can make a valuable contribution to the discussion of population by calling attention to the Gospel message and to her social teaching which applies the Gospel to the changing situations of man's life on earth. Indeed, as Pope Paul has stated in the encyclical *On the Development of Peoples*, 'A renewed consciousness of the demands of the Gospel makes it the Church's duty to put herself at the service of all men, to help them grasp their serious problem in all its dimensions, and to convince them that solidarity in action at this turning point in human history is a matter of urgency.'"

STATEMENT ON POPULATION
National Conference of Catholic Bishops
November 12, 1973